DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 124 SP 033 465

AUTHOR Impink-Hernandez, M. V., Ed.
TITLE Colloquium To Strengthen Educational Personnel Training Programs: Training Educational Personnel To Work with Language Minority Populations. Proceedings (1st, Washington, D.C., July 28-31, 1987).
INSTITUTION Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-87840-216-0
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 81p.
AVAILABLE FROM Georgetown University Press, Georgetown University, ICC Room 111, Washington, DC 20057.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education Programs; *Cooperative Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Institutional Mission; *Limited English Speaking; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; *Training Needs

ABSTRACT

This publication focuses on how bilingual education and English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher training programs can be enhanced in the areas of coordination, institutionalization, and evaluation and serves as a resource for institutions which train personnel to work with children who have limited English proficiency. The colloquium was designed to allow intensive small group interaction and whole group sharing; it sought to: (1) reflect the uniqueness of groups drawn together by the conference format; (2) present state-of-the-art practices in Educational Personnel Training Programs (EPTPs); and (3) suggest promising practices to future program directors and policymakers. The document is organized into three sections. The first section addresses coordination relevant to successful EPTP implementation with postsecondary institutions, state education agencies, local education agencies, and other Title VII and non-Title VII resources. Section two treats issues of institutionalization and discusses staff and faculty resources; inter- and intra-departmental coordination; recognition of student characteristics; student recruitment; budget planning; and cost assumption. The final section considers EPTP evaluation concerns wherein the group participants sought to develop a comprehensive framework for program assessment procedures. The agenda, participant data, and other conference information are appended. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED347124

COLLOQUIUM TO STRENGTHEN EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL TRAINING PROGRAMS:

Training Educational Personnel to Work with Language Minority Populations

Proceedings

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Published by Georgetown University Press
for the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs
U.S. Department of Education

SP 033 465

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COLLOQUIUM TO STRENGTHEN EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL TRAINING PROGRAMS:

Training Educational Personnel to Work with Language Minority Populations

Proceedings

Published by Georgetown University Press
for the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs
U.S. Department of Education

These Proceedings were prepared with partial funding from the United States Department of Education Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the OBEMLA or the United States Department of Education.

Copyright © 1989 by Georgetown University Press
All Rights Reserved
Printed in the United States of America

ISBN 0-87840-216-0

COLLOQUIUM PLANNING COMMITTEE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Bilingual Education
and Minority Languages Affairs

Rudy Munis
Mary Britt
Ray Chavez
Cynthia Ryan

George Washington University

Joel Gómez
Minerva Gorena

Georgetown University

John J. Staczek

COLLOQUIUM PROCEEDINGS COMMITTEE

George Washington University

Joel Gómez
Minerva Gorena

D & L Translation Associates, Inc.

Patricia Louque

Proceedings Editor
M.V. Impink-Hernández

Contents v

Preface vi

Acknowledgements viii

List of Acronyms ix

Introduction 1

1. Coordination 4

1.0 Introduction 4

1.0.1 EPTPs and post-secondary education 4
1.0.2 SEAs and EPTPs 4
1.0.3 LEAS and EPTP 4
1.0.4 EPTP and Title VII and other agencies 5

1.1 Post-secondary institutions 5

1.1.1 Purposes served by coordination with other IHE training programs 6
1.1.2 Target groups for coordination in post-secondary institutions 6
1.1.2.1 Our home institutions 7
1.1.2.2 Other Title VII four-year training programs 9
1.1.2.3 Community Colleges 10

1.2 State education agencies 14

1.2.1 Needs assessment 14
1.2.2 Technical assistance 15
1.2.3 Curriculum/materials development 16
1.2.4 Credentialing 17
1.2.5 Linkages/procedures 17
1.2.6 Future discussions 18

1.3 Local education agencies 18

1.3.1 Needs assessment 19
1.3.2 Recruitment 21
1.3.3 Field Experience/placement 21
1.3.4 Parent involvement/advisory council 22

1.4 Other Title VII and non-Title VII resources 23

1.4.1 MRCs 24
1.4.2 EACs 25
1.4.3 NCBE 25
1.4.4 OBEMLA 24
1.4.5 Community organizations 26
1.4.6 Educational organizations 26
1.4.7 Future discussions regarding coordination 27

2. Institutionalization 29

2.1 Staff and faculty resources 31

2.1.1 Attracting qualified staff 32
2.1.2 Faculty orientation 33
2.1.3 Staff development 34
2.1.4 Faculty retention/tenuring 34
2.1.5 Administrative and faculty support 34

2.2 Inter- and Intra-departmental coordination 35

2.2.1 Course development/cataloguing 36
2.2.2 Degree program/ curriculum development 37
2.2.3 Student advising 38
2.2.4 Student progress monitoring 39

2.3 Recognition of student characteristics and student recruitment 39

2.3.1 Student Characteristics 40
2.3.2 Recruitment procedures 41
2.3.3 Selection criteria 43
2.3.4 Language proficiency requirements 45
2.3.5 Program academic standards 46
2.3.6 Retaining students 47

2.4 Budget planning and IHE cost assumption 49

3. Evaluation 53
3.1 Purposes of evaluation 53
3.2 Areas to be investigated in EPTP evaluations 54
3.3 EPTP evaluation focus, design, and methodology 56

Appendices

Appendix A: Colloquium agenda 59
Appendix B: Small group participants and affiliations 63
Appendix C: Small group discussion format - instrumentation and documentation 68

Preface

The Colloquium to Strengthen Educational Personnel Training Projects was the first national conference sponsored by Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs which focused on current issues related to administering and improving teacher training programs.

To help us address these issues, we invited directors of Educational Personnel Training projects as well as representatives of State education agencies, local education agencies and members of the Title VII support services network.

The following manual is the result of their intensive and productive discussions on how bilingual education and ESL teacher training programs can be enhanced in the areas of coordination, institutionalization and evaluation.

We hope that this manual will serve as both a useful guide for colleges and universities planning new teacher training programs, and as a resource for institutions which are currently training personnel to work with limited English proficient children.

We are grateful for the contributions of all participants who made the production of this manual possible. We also wish to thank John Staczek of Georgetown University and Joel Gómez and Minerva Gorena of George Washington University for their assistance in planning the conference and in coordinating the publishing of the manual.

Alicia Coro, Director
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Bilingual Education and
Minority Languages Affairs

Acknowledgements

The collective thoughts and ideas contained within these proceedings can be attributed to the Educational Personnel Training Program representatives participating in the Colloquium.

Special recognition is given to the nine team leaders who worked with the small groups to help them focus on the assigned topics and to lead the discussions. These included:

Andrea Bermúdez, *University of Houston, Texas*
Jesus Cortez, *California State University at Chico*
Donaldo Macedo, *University of Massachusetts at Boston*
Maria Torres, *State University of New York at Buffalo*
Macario Saldate, *University of Arizona at Temple*
Solomon Flores, *University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee*
Annette López, *Kean College of New Jersey*
Ron Schwartz, *University of Maryland at Baltimore County*
Reyes Mazón, *Texas Southern University, Houston*

Small group session recorders responsible for capturing the discussion highlights for these proceedings were:

Philip Bray	Theo Mantzanas	Pat Louque
Gabina Suazo	Dawn Center	María Torres
Tori Impink-Hernández	Terry Weldon	Jeannette Kwok

Three of the small group recorders served as preliminary editors responsible for reviewing and reformating the notes taken by the recorders for each major Colloquium theme:

Jeannette Kwok
Gabina Suazo
Theo Mantzanas

Special thanks and appreciation are extended to the proceedings editor, M.V. Impink-Hernández, who graciously accepted the responsibility of rewriting and synthesizing the ideas, thoughts, and

recommendations of the Colloquium participants into a cohesive and informative document.

And, finally, extraordinary thanks goes to Kathy Croft and Laura Klos Sokol of Georgetown University for their assistance with final draft copy of this document and to Cynthia Gayton for her expert hand at desk-top publishing.

List of Acronyms in this Document

EAC	Evaluation Assessment Centers (funded under Title VII)
EPTP	Educational Personnel Training Program, funded through Title VII for preparation of and skill development in educators serving language
ESL	English as a Second Language--generally used in reference to instructional programs for limited-English-proficient persons
IHE	Institution of Higher Education (The term 'home IHE' refers to the post-secondary institution housing or responsible for a given Educational Personnel Training Program)
LEA	Local Education Agency
MRC	Multifunctional Resource Center (funded under Title VII)
NCBE	National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (funded under Title VII)
OBEMLA	Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, the U.S. Department of Education
PAC	Parent Advisory Council
SEA	State Education Agency

0. Introduction

In July, 1987, the United States Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA), convened directors of federally-funded programs who train educational personnel for minority language populations in the 'Colloquium to Strengthen Educational Personnel Training Programs: Training Future Educational Personnel to Work with Language Minority Populations.'

Directors of federally-funded bilingual education/ESL programs at the post-secondary level have repeatedly requested opportunities to meet as a group since inception of such programs. This first meeting of Educational Personnel Training Program (EPTP) directors reflects both the commitment of OBEMLA to learn from experienced program directors and the commitment of program directors to learn from each other.

In planning the agenda for this meeting, OBEMLA actively sought input from EPTP directors. The directors specified to OBEMLA areas of interest that could contribute to the effectiveness of their programs; namely, 'Coordination', 'Institutionalization', and 'Evaluation'. With areas of interest specified, OBEMLA devised a schedule of activities for the directors that would allow them to share experience in all three areas.

The Colloquium was designed to allow intensive small group interaction and whole group sharing. The three major discussion areas (Coordination, Institutionalization, and Evaluation) were divided into subtopic areas for discussion. Considering the topics of interest to the EPTP directors, OBEMLA also invited experts from State Educational Agencies who coordinate relevant activities with Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs). OBEMLA then assigned all invited participants to small groups with specific attention to each expert's areas of expertise and interests, and to the demographic characteristics of individual EPTP programs.

A Colloquium Planning Committee developed a structure for group discussions. The small groups were provided with forms and suggestions that first encouraged individual participants to consider practices successful in their own local program operations, and then asked them to consider, with the group, recommendations for successful EPTP program implementation.

Using the suggested format, participants could structure their small group recommendations for (1) establishing goals associated with specific coordination, institutionalization, or evaluation efforts; (2) outlining strategies to respond to established goals; and (3) evaluating program effectiveness relative to established goals.

This discussion format for developing recommendations is called the 'consensus model'. The format allows experts to compare their experiences with each others' and to agree upon advice to be passed on to future program directors. The 'consensus model' format also provides latitude in reporting: small group reports could reflect the unique group 'personality' emerging from intensive discussion.

From this perspective, these colloquium proceedings seek to do the following:

(1) Reflect the uniqueness of groups drawn together by the conference format;
(2) Present state-of-the-art practices in EPTP coordination, institutionalization and evaluation; and
(3) Suggest promising practices for EPTP implementation to future program directors.

To accomplish these goals, the document is organized around the three major themes of the colloquium.

The first section of this document addresses the areas of 'coordination' relevant to successful EPTP implementation. Although the concept of 'coordination' was not defined for colloquium participants, all appeared to share an understanding of the notion: 'Coordination' labels a set of specific activities undertaken to integrate program services and resources with those available in the surrounding environment--within an institution, across institutions, and in the community at large. As such, 'coordination' efforts allow EPTPs to join forces with other agencies in serving not only post-secondary students (the immediate recipients of IHE services); but also in meeting the needs of younger students in bilingual and ESL programs, whose education depends on the effectiveness of EPTPs. In addition, 'coordination' assists in building credibility and security for EPTPs. By working cooperatively with existing agencies, the EPTP establishes its unique role and its unique purposes in the eyes of people outside the program. In addressing the colloquium's 'Coordination' theme, four major areas were identified. Coordination with:

- Post-secondary institutions
- State education agencies;
- Local education agencies;
- Other Title VII and non-Title VII resources.

Four small groups were asked to discuss effective strategies for addressing one of the above four coordination areas.

The second section of this document treats issues of 'institutionalization'. Again, although participants were not provided with a definition of 'institutionalization', a shared notion of the term's meaning was apparent in colloquium discussions: It is a process through which externally funded projects become part and parcel of an institution. For EPTPs, this means that the home IHE accepts the program, assumes costs of program operation, and supports program personnel. 'Institutionalization' activities are not only called for by federal EPTP regulations, they are also critical to ensuring program longevity. One discussion group was assigned to each of the following 'Institutionalization' topics:

- Staff and faculty resources;
- Inter-/Intra-departmental coordination;
- Recognition of student characteristics and student recruitment; and,
- Budget planning and cost assumption.

The third section of this document considers EPTP evaluation concerns. Historically, bilingual education/ESL personnel training programs have not documented their effectiveness. This situation undermines achievement of program goals--especially, in the areas of coordination and institutionalization--simply because it is difficult to build program credibility when 'hard' evidence is not available. Evaluation issues were discussed by a single small group, which sought to develop a comprehensive framework for developing program assessment procedures that would strengthen EPTPs.

Obviously, the three themes for this colloquium are interrelated. 'coordination' and 'evaluation' contribute to (and are necessary for) program 'institutionalization'. Small group commentary that may appear to be repetitive when reading through the document, in fact, reflects the convergence of concerns identified by EPTP directors.

It is hoped that these proceedings will serve as a resource for current and future EPTP directors and for policy-makers. Its contents surely reflect the shared wisdom of the persons most experienced in implementing programs for training bilingual/ESL educators.

1. Coordination

1.0 Introduction. This section of the Colloquium proceedings focuses on issues of coordination. The term 'coordination' is frequently used, but rarely defined--perhaps, because coordination activities often involve the development of subtle working relationships, built on trust and interpersonal rapport. Single-step procedures for establishing such relationships cannot be prescribed; rather, the relationships must be cultivated over time through on-going, context-sensitive efforts to form mutually beneficial and harmonious partnerships.

In discussing coordination topics, participants continuously emphasized the importance of communication, and sharing of ideas and expertise, in addition to exchange of material resources. Involving a wide spectrum of concerned parties in planning, implementing, and monitoring EPTPs both builds a base of support for the projects and strengthens the project designs.

Four small groups of Colloquium participants discussed EPTP roles, responsibilities, goals, and strategies for coordinating with agencies identified as influential in EPTP success.

1.0.1 EPTPs and post-secondary education. The first small group examined the relationship between EPTPs and post-secondary institutions, in general, identifying frameworks for developing strong linkages between EPTPs and (1) their home institutions, (2) other four-year institutions, and (3) two-year post-secondary programs.

1.0.2 SEAS and EPTPs. The second small group explored the underlying purposes of and promising strategies for establishing rapport between SEAs and EPTPs. In so doing, the group considered collaborative arrangements in the areas of (1) Needs Assessment, (2) Technical Assistance, (3) Curriculum and Materials Development, (4) Credentialing, and (5) Linkage. In addition, this group identified topics that they hoped to discuss in future EPTP directors' meetings.

1.0.3. LEAs and EPTP. The third small group worked in the area of LEA-EPTP coordination. The members first pointed out historical barriers to successful LEA-EPTP cooperation, then highlighted promising strategies for strengthening LEA-EPTP partnerships. This group organized its report around topics in (1) Needs Assessment, (2)

Recruitment, (3) Field Experience and Coursework for EPTP Students, and (4) Parent Involvement and Advisory Councils.

1.0.4 EPTP and Title VII and other agencies. The fourth small group considered issues of EPTP coordination with Title VII resource centers and with other non-Title VII agencies. This group, which included both EPTP and Title VII service center representatives, first worked toward identifying their respective roles, responsibilities, and limitations in coordination activities, producing specific suggestions for enhancing supportive relationships within the Title VII network --between EPTPs and (1) MRCs, (2) EACs, (3) NCBE, and (4) OBEMLA. Next, the group focused discussions on community and educational organizations. Emerging from these discussions was a shared perception that outreach activities must be undertaken to create public awareness of the purposes of EPTPs and Title VII, in general. The group's report concludes with recommended topics for study in future EPTP meetings.

Overall, the four small groups agreed that:

(1) Effective coordination is a critical element in successful EPTP functioning;
(2) Further work must be conducted to define and clarify the roles and responsibilities of EPTPs in initiating and participating in coordination activities; and,
(3) Increased support for EPTP coordination activities would substantially contribute to the development of a commonly adopted understanding of standards for bilingual and ESL educational personnel training.

1.1 Post-secondary institutions. Both short- and long-term success of a federally-funded bilingual/ESL Educational Personnel Training Program (EPTP) relies heavily on the degree to which it responds to needs not formerly addressed, and complements services provided in the larger context. Systematic efforts to coordinate and integrate project service delivery with available resources are, therefore, essential to effective and efficient project functioning.

Recognizing the contributions of coordination to bilingual/ESL educator training efforts in post-secondary institutions, and having learned how to incorporate our projects with other Institution of Higher Education (IHE) programs in the past twenty years, we will articulate below the purposes of and effective procedures for coordinating project services across post-secondary education settings.

For our purposes, we have conceived of coordination in a broad sense to include processes of:

(1) *Networking*: Information and idea sharing with colleagues not intimately associated with our own EPTPs;

(2) *Collaboration*: Combining resources available in other settings or programs to enable each to reach its goals efficiently;

(3) *Integration*: Infusing project activities and resources into existing programs to accomplish desired goals in effective and efficient manners; and,

(4) *Linkage*: Establishing productive and on-going relationships with programs, agencies, and institutions that are mutually supportive.

1.1.1 Purposes served by coordination with other IHE training programs. Given this framework, we believe that coordination activities can serve projects from the moment of inception to the time of institutionalization. First, coordination activities can guide program conceptualization by helping planners to assess needs for some type of intervention and to envision the broad configuration of an appropriate intervention. Then, by investigating available resources and working with experts to identify gaps in existing services, planners can build a base of evidence that (1) guides formulation of project objectives, (2) identifies appropriate populations to be served, and (3) creates awareness of and sensitivity to political issues that may affect project effectiveness.

Secondly, once a project is funded, coordination activities can facilitate translation of proposed efforts into a functioning program. At this stage, project managers can build political support for the program and benefit from expertise and resources of non-project personnel by involving key persons (or stakeholders) as advisors in start-up activities.

Finally, if coordination activities are functioning productively, they can lead to institutionalization of the project. Both stakeholder involvement in designing and monitoring project service delivery and stakeholder awareness of project success build institutional commitment to long-term maintenance and expansion of the program.

1.1.2 Target groups for coordination in post-secondary institutions. We find that our purposes and procedures for coordination in post-secondary institutional settings cluster into three basic groupings, each of which interacts slightly differently with our projects:

(1) Persons, resources, and programs within our home institutions;
(2) Persons, resources, and programs (both Title VII and non-Title VII) associated with other four-year IHEs; and,
(3) Persons, resources and programs associated with two-year IHEs (community and junior colleges, and technical/professional schools).

In conjunction with our coordination efforts with these three clusters, other non-IHE training projects and agencies also interact with our projects. Our specific coordination procedures and purposes

with reference to each cluster follow. Where appropriate, the inclusion of non-IHE training programs in joint activities will be noted.

1.1.2.1 Home institutions. Our goals for coordination within our home institution involve project conceptualization, implementation, and institutionalization. Objectives for coordination in each of these areas will be discussed briefly:

(1) Conceptualizing the program
- *Formulate objectives*: Coordination across the home IHE departments, divisions, and faculties allows for identification and definition of realistic objectives for an EPTP. For instance, an IHE with a strong ethnic studies program or strong language and linguistics departments can conceptualize an EPTP that taps into the existing course offerings.
- *Identify the student population for recruitment*: By communicating with existing IHE programs, planners can identify the most appropriate target population (that which is accessible and in need) to be served by an EPTP.
- *Identify political issues*: Through networking, planners can gain exposure to and begin to understand the political agenda of the home IHE, in relation to local, state, and national policy. This understanding allows planners to create a program that is feasible given these contexts and that promises to be well received.

(2) Operationalizing and implementing the program
- *Identify resources and key people*: Looking at the IHE's organizational resources (human and materials) allows program managers to translate the conceptualized project into a program that can serve its intended (and realistic) goals without duplicating existing resources.
- *Utilize resources*: Coordination permits (1) the possibility of shaping a program that taps available material resources, and (2) allocation of federal resources to areas where institutional deficiencies exist.
- *Create political unity*: Involving stakeholders (administrators, deans, interdepartmental faculty members) in the planning and implementation of an EPTP facilitates institutional commitment to the EPTP, creates interdepartmental ownership, and may forestall perceptions of the EPTP as a 'stepchild', a non-relevant, short-term, or inferior program.
- *Involve key people*: Bringing together the expertise within an IHE for personnel training assists the process of defining programmatic specifics: what is needed, how can/should

those needs be met in terms of course offerings, student populations to be served, and intended outcomes.

(3) Institutionalizing the program
- *Involve relevant stakeholders* (department chairs, deans, recruitment offices, etc.) within the IHE such that ownership of the program is shared with them and commitments to institutionalization are increased.

Next we present an outline of activities which address the goals and objectives associated with conceptualizing, operationalizing, and institutionalizing an EPTP:

Form an advisory/liaison committee to involve faculty colleagues and administrators (deans, in particular) and other key people in programmatic decision-making, to ensure their awareness of program goals and objectives, to increase their support for the program, and to avail the program of valuable specialty expertise:

- *Delineate responsibilities and define jurisdictions over curriculum content, course assignments, and the like*: Through networking across departments, identify with colleagues available content area expertise and realistic courseloads for faculty. (These decisions need to be made jointly and in advance of program implementation.)
- *Establish entrance/exit requirements for program participants*: Again, by networking with existing programs, identify (1) institutional demands for entrance and exit screening procedures, and (2) the efforts that must be undertaken to ensure that the program standards are at least as high as those observed at the institutional level and to ensure program credibility. (This may require development of new language or skill measurement instruments.)
- *Engage other faculty in research on limited-English-proficient populations (LEP)*: By highlighting LEP populations as worthy of and interesting for research studies, faculty colleagues may be enticed to support the project and may be able to contribute to improvement or strengthening of the program design and content.
- *Maintain information dissemination channels with the IHE community*: Develop newsletters and establish formal and informal communication channels to ensure that the IHE community is aware that the program exists and is cognizant of program accomplishments. Keeping colleagues in other departments and divisions apprised of the EPTP progress may support recruitment efforts and institutionalization, in general.
- *Involve key personnel in hiring program applicants*: By involving cross-disciplinary staff in programmatic decisions,

opportunities for utilization of expertise and for institutionalization are enhanced.

- *Integrate program components*: Avoid duplication of existing services, programs, and expertise by networking across disciplines. Tapping available resources allows appropriation of external funds to areas in which the IHE is weak.
- Identify agents controlling funds and monies dedicated to indirect costs such that lines of authority and accountability for the use of these funds are clear.
- Establish a student network, including alumni, to extend participation in coordination activities beyond formal service delivery operations.

1.1.2.2 Other Title VII and non-Title VII four-year training programs. Our primary goal in coordinating with four-year IHE training programs outside our home institutions is to share knowledge, and resources. In addition, we believe that such coordination helps to prevent service duplication, to diminish competition for students, and to maximize the probability that a wide variety of needs can be met, given the range of expertise and resources available outside any single EPTP. Finally, we believe that cross-institution coordination can serve to build political unity. Cooperation across IHE programs in training educational personnel creates the possibility for joint (or at least compatible) policy formation. Once a cooperative network is established, the voice of multiple programs can address political issues surrounding IHE educational efforts.

Activities we suggest for meeting these goals for coordinating with IHE program outside our home institutions include:

- *Exchange consultant expertise*: Faculty members associated with an EPTP project and talented, advanced students in the project can be used by other training institutions for a wide variety of purposes: They can serve as adjunct professors for specific training activities (both pre- and inserve). They can assist in planning new bilingual education programs and in improving or evaluating existing bilingual programs.
- A particularly interesting application of this sharing has been the use of EPTP experts in other institutions with similar programmatic focus to evaluate the home-institution's project. This procedure not only increases the likelihood of productive evaluation, it also promotes exchange of ideas and resources among institutions.
- *Provide for team-teaching across universities and coordinate joint projects*: This strategy benefits EPTPs in at least two ways. First, project students gain exposure to a wider spectrum of thinking on specialized issues in education. Second, a routine is established for EPTP faculty and

managers to exchange ideas, philosophies, and research with colleagues in the field.

- *Have universities award credit jointly*: The utilization of expertise and programmatic strengths across universities (or across university programs) can:
  - Minimize duplication of services in a geographic region;
  - Reduce competition for students;
  - Maximize use of the limited human and material resources available; and,
  - Provide students with flexibility in scheduling coursework.

An example of such efforts uses televised media for courses, where experts teach content material and all participating universities award credit to students who complete course requirements.

- *Exchange students for a semester or summer program*: This allows students an opportunity to explore content areas better addressed by other programs.

1.1.2.3 Community colleges. Focused and structured linkage between EPTPs and two-year post-secondary programs, or community colleges, strengthens educational programs in each institution and increased students' abilities to reach their educational potential. In addition, comprehensive coordination between community colleges and EPTPs increases the available student pool for both institutions. Under firm articulation agreements, students in two-year programs are assured that they can continue study in an advanced program, and EPTPs are provided with a sizable number of recruitable, qualified program candidates.

From this perspective, our objectives for EPTP-Community College Coordination in summary are to:

- *Establish 2 + 2 articulation agreements*: Successful coordination depends, in large part, on the degree to which fluid articulation agreements between community colleges and EPTPs are established. Such articulation must clarify and delineate entrance/exit requirements for programs at various levels and provide that two-year institutional coursework will transfer in useful ways to four-year programs. It is critical that faculty and administrators in two- and four-year institutions understand each other's programs, course requirements, and standards in order to ensure that students are counseled into personally appropriate educational settings and to facilitate student transfer across programs.
- *Actively recruit minority students*: Coordination in this area increases the pool of qualified minority candidates to pursue advanced academic study in a four-year EPTP. It should

be remembered that minority students are overrepresented in two-year post-secondary programs and seriously underrepresented in four-year post-secondary programs. Well-defined articulation agreements can help to route minority students into advanced study programs, given (1) adequate test-taking training, (2) remedial programs (if necessary), and (3) support systems that emphasize the strengths and wealth of knowledge and insight that minority students can bring to educational training programs.

- *To replicate prototype articulation models in other community colleges and EPTPs*: Once successful collaboration between two- and four-year institutional programs for bilingual/ESL personnel has been effected, the model can be transported to other settings.
- *To establish support systems including mentorships, financial assistance, club memberships, and tutorial assistance such that minority students are given the opportunity to meet entrance requirements for four-year IHE programs*: Students transferring from two-year to four-year programs (minority students, in particular) may need careful consideration of their unique needs and strengths with reference to the four-year EPTP. Establishment of appropriate support networks greatly enhances student opportunities for career success and success in recruitment/retention programmatic efforts.
- *Share available resources*: Community college EPTP programs are developing materials and expertise, just as four-year institutions are. Sharing, once again, prevents 'reinventing the wheel' and strengthens each type of program.

Given these objectives, we recommend strongly that EPTPs undertake the following coordination activities:

- *Establish an 'exchange of views' committee, including IHE and community college personnel to review, revise, and/or delete curriculum and programs*: Articulation agreements are best constructed by the faculty involved in program development at each level.
- *Identify factors that attract two-year students into four-year programs through surveys and/or coordination with recruitment and counselling services in the two- and four-year institutions.*
- *Conduct on-site visits to recruit students*: While these visits will be conducted primarily by faculty of four-year EPTPs, targeting students for transfer into advanced levels of study, they may also be conducted by two-year institution faculty to identify students in four-year programs that might better be served, initially, in a community college setting.

- *Establish a feedback loop*: Keep community colleges informed about the progress of former students and work with the two-year faculty to identify students who may be interested in advance study on the EPTP.
- *Inform counselors in minority student affairs offices of project activities and provide joint counselling for transferring students.*
- Establish ethnic clubs to provide peer support to minority students recruited into the four-year EPTP and a *student activities office* or forum to ensure that the ethnic clubs do not lead to formation of isolated cliques.
- *Disseminate EPTP information to a broad variety of audiences*, for example, employers, students, and community college faculty.

Evaluation of EPTP coordination efforts with post-secondary programs and institutions. In implementing coordination activities to support project efforts, we recognize that their utility must be monitored and assessed systematically. Therefore, we recommend that projects establish, within the framework of their general monitoring and evaluation procedures, specific activities and timelines for qualitative and quantitative collection of data that will allow for structured assesments of coordination efforts. Evaluation of coordination efforts should be both formative and summative--beginning with needs assessments, continuing through process studies to allow for modification of activities, if necessary, and culminating in impact studies to judge the effectiveness of collaborative linkages.

The following data sources may be particularly useful for monitoring and conducting formative evaluations of a project's coordination efforts:

- Minutes from inter-departmental, inter-institutional, and advisory committee meetings;
- Documentation of applications and information requests;
- On-going collection of course evaluations completed by students;
- Interviews with faculty supervising student field placements;
- Records of student academic progress; and,
- Follow-up surveys of project graduates.

In addition, the following data sources can be used to monitor coordination activities involving other Title VII and non-Title VII IHE programs:

- Records from jointly-sponsored conferences and training events;
- Records of consultant and resource sharing, documentation of information and material sharing;

- Collaboratively developed position papers and monographs; and
- Records of student exchanges.

Finally, evidence for summative evaluation of coordination within and outside the home IHE might include:

- Measures of lasting impact, such as program institutionalization; and,
- Measures of capacity building, such as cooperative alliances and resource sharing within and outside the home IHE.

Recommendations for improving EPTP coordination at the post-secondary Level. As suggested throughout this report, we firmly believe that (1) comprehensive coordination plans for EPTPs within the home institution and with other IHEs (both two- and four-year) are critical for project success; and (2) the 'know-how' for successful coordination exists in the community of current and former EPTP participants, faculty, and administration. At the same time, we recognize that successful coordination is impeded in some settings by non-supportive aspects of institutional and federal policy. From our collective experience, we propose below specific recommendations for the administration in EPTP home institutions and for OBEMLA the post-secondary level.

Recommendations to IHE administrations:

- *Provide salaries and/or incentives for writing grants*: At the institutional level, incentives must be provided to faculty members for proposal writing. At present, faculty assessment for promotion frequently does not consider the efforts directed toward establishing new and innovative programs responsive to needs that can be addressed by the institution.
- *Allow for the hiring of personnel to handle coordination functions of an EPTP or compensate EPTP faculty for handling these functions.*
- *Diversify recruitment strategies IHE-wide*: Structuring recruitment strategies to involve EPTP faculty with the institutional recruitment office enhances the likelihood that minority candidates will be contacts.
- *Demonstrate commitment to the institutionalization of the EPTP* by placing project faculty on tenure-track, recognizing EPTP unique course offerings, and incorporating the suggestions posed in Baecher (1983) in institutional policy.
- *Develop efficient means for responding to concerns voiced by EPTPs*, possibly through implementing an electronic mail system.

As a final note, we would like to thank OBEMLA for bringing us together for this colloquium. This forum serves to develop

coordination, linkage, and networking among EPTP directors and programs in post-secondary institutions.

1.2 State education agencies. Given EPTP responsibilities for training teachers and administrators who must meet State Educational Agency (SEA) approval and who meet needs identified at the state level, we are very much aware of the need for coordination with our SEAs. We must design programs that can supply needed educators for limited-English-proficient and bilingual persons in our states; we must prepare future educational personnel with skills and content that meet state requirements. To do so, we must develop relationships with SEAs that help to guide our training efforts. This requires not only communication but coordination. We can serve SEAs in an advisory capacity, helping to determine standards for bilingual/ESL educator certification. At the same time, SEAs can assist us in designing programs that meet state needs and expectations. We have considered many areas for coordination with SEAs. Following is an outline of our recommendations, by areas of critical interest.

1.2.1 Needs assessment. To assess successfully state needs for bilingual/ESL educators, we believe that coordination with SEAs can serve the following purposes:

- *Sharing information on policies and services*: By communicating with SEA officials, EPTP directors can tailor programs to state requirements. Establishment of formal and informal communication channels, linking EPTPs and SEAs, can support efforts to define training needs for future bilingual education/ESL personnel.
- *Accessing expertise outside bilingual education/ESL disciplines*: SEAs employ persons who specialize in a broad range of content areas that relate to the educational needs of Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) and bilingual students. Interaction with these experts would contribute to appropriate and comprehensive EPTP development.
- *Developing a child-centered approach for EPTP participants*: Again information-sharing between EPTPs and SEAs can reinforce commitments to train personnel responsive to the individual child's developmental needs.
- *Establishing a computer network for EPTPs and SEAs*: More a statement of need than an aspect of coordination appropriate for SEA-EPTP needs assessment activities, we believe that automated systems facilitating SEA-EPTP communication are necessary for successful accomplishment of the above-stated goals.

Among the activities that respond to these goals, we suggest the following:

- *Include SEA officials on advisory committees developing EPTP policies*: Become involved in SEA policy-making where bilingual education and ESL personnel are likely to be affected;
- *Target EPTP student recruitment toward areas of shortage identified by SEAs*: Cooperate with SEAs to develop recruitment strategies responsive to state-level needs;
- *Participate in building the capacity of local- and state-level, Title VII-funded projects*: By working with LEA capacity-building programs, EPTPs can carry to SEAs further understanding of local needs for trained personnel;
- *Participate in service bilingual education and ESL activities to gain further understanding of their needs and levels of skill*: Present in relevant conferences, workshops, and other programs;
- Work with SEAs to define the role of bilingual education and ESL personnel at local and state levels;
- In conjunction with SEA experts, identify bilingual education and ESL personnel needs with regard to learning how to work effectively within bureaucracies;
- Tap interdisciplinary experts (both from SEAs and internal to the IHE- grantee) in defining the training needs of bilingual education and ESL personnel;
- Involve parents and teachers in needs assessment research;
- Recognize the important roles SEAs and EPTPs play in accomplishing their major goal, that is, serving LEP and bilingual students;
- Actively present former EPTP and SEA accomplishments in preparing educational personnel for bilingual education and ESL programs to superiors to build credibility for future training activities;
- Develop EPTP student test-taking skills relative to their profession.

1.2.2 Technical assistance. In considering relationships between SEAs and EPTPs in the area of technical assistance, we have identified three major purposes of coordination:

- Sharing group and individual expertise available in SEAs, IHEs, and individual EPTPs;
- Disseminating information on assistance available through each institution; and,
- Referring students and recruits to agencies best able to respond to identified needs.

To serve these purposes, we suggest the following activities:

- Increase EPTP involvement in disseminating information on training opportunities available through SEA and IHE programs. In so doing, enhance the visibility of SEAs as resources for EPTPs;
- Demonstrate support for training activities undertaken by SEAs, by attending and co-sponsoring conferences convened by SEAs;
- Improve coordination of data collection efforts undertaken by EPTPs, LEAs, and SEAs to guide overall improvement of educational services for LEP and bilingual students; and,
- Elicit assistance from SEAs in IHE proposal writing activities regarding EPTPs, to increase success in project approval, relative to state and local needs.

Focusing on strategies for EPTP coordination with SEAs in the area of technical assistance, we recognize that neither SEAs nor IHEs have formally or consistently attempted to disseminate information on each other's activities. We believe that this situation would be improved if the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) were directed to provide information and dissemination services for Title VII SEA and IHE programs.

1.2.3 Curriculum/materials development. While we recognize that curriculum and materials development efforts are prime in selecting activities for building EPTP and SEA coordination, we realize that the goals for such coordination and associated activities are fairly self-evident. We would articulate our goals for coordinating with SEAs in curriculum/materials development as the following:

- To match IHE objectives for training ESL and bilingual education personnel with SEA objectives in educating LEP/bilingual students;
- To share curriculum and materials expertise across SEAs and EPTPs; and,
- Through understanding SEA requirements, to create consistency in coursework offered by various EPTPs.

Activities that can accommodate these goals include:

- Joining together SEA and EPTP information bases to identify materials and resources for bilingual education and ESL personnel;
- Linking materials databanks compiled by other Title VII grantees with SEA and local EPTP materials databanks; and
- Encouraging the active involvement of EPTP participants and staff on committees for field testing, evaluating, and developing materials to be approved for use by SEAs.

We realize, unfortunately, that the activities associated with SEA-EPTP coordination in the area of curriculum/materials development

rely almost entirely on success in SEA-EPTP resource-sharing, with systems for sharing personnel, money, and facilities formalized. To accomplish curriculum/materials development goals, methods for institutionalizing resource-sharing must be established.

1.2.4 Credentialing. Our purposes for working with SEAs in the area of educational personnel credentialing are clear: we must ensure that our graduates meet SEA certification and licensing requirements. In designing EPTPs that meet both SEA levels of expectation for and our understanding of the professional development needs of bilingual and ESL educators, we suggest working with SEAs such that both institutions agree upon standards for credentialing ESL/bilingual educators. To accomplish this goal, we suggest that SEAs and EPTPs work together to:

- Identify required bilingual/ESL educator competencies;
- Establish national standards for bilingual/ESL competency, given current shortages, and to facilitate transfer for students across federally funded EPTPs;
- Plan recruitment efforts outside the U.S.;
- Define the instructional roles assumed by bilingual/ESL educators; and,
- Identify guidelines for assessing bilingual/ESL educator competency, in terms of language proficiency requirements, and cultural-awareness.

Regarding credentialing of bilingual/ESL personnel, we realize that SEAs and EPTPs differ in their expectations and standards when compared across the nation. We feel that it is imperative that these agencies work cooperatively to understand and establish, with national consistency, the necessary competencies required of personnel involved in bilingual and ESL education.

1.2.5 Linkages/procedures. Consistent with the above recommendations, we again emphasize that EPTPs can serve their purposes only if linkages can be established between EPTPs and SEAs to build program articulation and to maximize resources known to be limited. In this vein, we emphasize that EPTPs and SEAs should devise formal mechanisms to:

- Disseminate all relevant information regarding services, courses, expertise, and funds available through specific bilingual and ESL projects; and,
- Share information from surrounding IHE and SEA offices, divisions, and agencies to ensure optimal use of available resources.

We believe that regular, formal and structured meetings lead to more fruitful coordination than less systematic telephone contacts or

incidental encounters. At present, EPTP travel restrictions cause difficulties in arranging such meetings between EPTPs and SEAs (and also, between EPTPs and Multifunctional Resource Centers (MRCs)). Nonetheless, we feel that thoughtful planning with other offices that provide bilingual education and ESL services in both SEAs and IHEs (for example, Vocational and Special Education Departments) may accommodate some efforts to develop SEA-EPTP linkage.

1.2.6 Future discussions. While we realize that only a few select topics can be covered in a two-day colloquium, we would like to identify priority areas for coordination between SEAs and EPTPs that should be addressed, formally, in the future:

- Special education/bilingual education;
- Capacity-building/management advisory;
- Program evaluation; and,
- Community involvement.

Coordination between specific bilingual education/ESL SEA offices and EPTPs in these areas would greatly facilitate coordination with other services available through the larger IHE and SEA structures and thereby, strengthen all training programs for personnel working with limited-English-proficient populations.

In summary, we believe that coordination between SEAs and EPTPs is not only critical for guiding development of appropriate professional standards for bilingual education and ESL personnel, but also, more important, such coordination can stimulate growth and improvement in personnel training services.

1.3 Local education agencies. Ultimately, the target beneficiaries of EPTPs are school-aged children in local bilingual education and ESL programs. EPTPs develop specialized skills in teachers and administrators who are working (or who intend to work) with limited-English-proficient (LEP) and bilingual students. For EPTPs to serve this purpose effectively, they must be designed to respond to the educational needs, priorities, and philosophies characterizing local schools and school districts.

From this perspective we believe that coordination between LEAs and EPTPs should develop into a long lasting partnership--one that provides constant feedback on (1) the needs of bilingual/ESL teachers and language minority students in local contexts, (2) progress made toward remediating problem areas where staff is concerned, and (3) outcomes of EPTP and LEA educational improvement efforts.

Prior to presenting our recommendations for building LEA-EPTP partnerships, however, we would like to note some limitations that have traditionally plagued LEA-EPTP coordination efforts. We feel that it is important for both the funding agency and IHE grantees to be made aware of impediments to the success of EPTPs (specifically

in the area of coordination with LEAs) and to work toward correcting these problems. Our most serious concerns include:

- Lack of funding for IHE personnel release time from academic duties to develop effective coordination and student recruitment strategies: Coordination and recruitment activities require time from trained professionals. An EPTP educator carrying a full course load has no time to devote to these activities;
- Preoccupation with issues of institutionalization (and the role coordination plays in institutionalizing services): Successful coordination stems, in part, from successful establishment of interpersonal relationships. Even normal rates of staff turnover in LEAs and IHEs threaten continuity in coordination areas. This problem is exacerbated by funding concerns. LEAs may be understandably reluctant to allocate resources for coordination with programs that are not yet institutionalized;
- Weak articulation between funded programs in the areas of needs assessment, recruitment, field experience placements, parent involvement and advisory councils. Unfortunately, externally-funded projects more often compete than cooperate in these areas; and,
- Oversights and exclusions in developing bilingual education and ESL networks. A prime example of such exclusion is evident in this very colloquium: No LEA representatives were present for these working sessions, although LEAs clearly rely upon the success of EPTPs.

Having acknowledged these concerns, we contend, nonetheless, that over the years EPTPs have developed systems and procedures for strengthening partnerships with LEAs. We will share our suggested coordination strategies below, organized under the topics we addressed in this colloquium.

1.3.1 Needs assessment. In order to design EPTPs that respond to LEA staffing needs, it is critical that IHEs and LEAs work together in identifying those needs--with reference to the needs of students in local schools at and to the specific demands for staff development where bilingual and English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) teachers and other educational personnel working with LEP students are concerned. EPTP efforts to establish and respond to school district needs must involve not only personnel in LEA offices for LEP education, but also personnel in other LEA service provision offices such as special education, vocational education, and counselling.

To collaborate with LEAs in assessing needs, we strongly advise the following:

- Establish both formal and informal communication channels with LEAs by scheduling regular meetings and by maintaining frequent correspondence and telephone contact;
- Involve representatives from local and state affiliates of professional organizations such as NABE and TESOL in LEA-EPTP networking activities in order to build credibility for coordination efforts at the 'grassroots' level;
- With the LEA, develop procedures for assessing and documenting LEP student needs--in so doing, it may be useful to tap a variety of information sources, such as state and local LAU, student assessment, and special education offices, to ensure the validity and reliability of collected data. (Unfortunately, data from various sources frequently conflict due to varying data collection strategies and purposes. Only careful inspection of data amassed from multiple sources can provide an accurate picture of local needs);
- Work with the LEA Personnel and Human Resource Offices to identify local needs for staff skilled in ESL and bilingual education--again, it may be productive to consider also data on personnel needs in specific LEAs through state-level offices for certification and accreditation; and,
- Implement procedures for ongoing evaluation and monitoring of LEA-EPTP interaction in assessing needs, by maintaining contact and communication logs to assess the effectiveness of coordination activities; and if necessary, by revising existing data collection instruments to gather sound information on LEA needs for bilingual and ESL personnel.

We realize that EPTP-LEA coordination in assessing needs lays the foundation and tone for all future coordination efforts. LEAs must feel sure that IHE-grantees carefully considered their individual needs when designing the EPTP and it is helpful if LEAs also feel some measure of ownership in the EPTP. Conversely, IHEs can benefit greatly from working closely with LEA teachers and administrators --persons most knowledgeable about local LEP and bilingual student populations--when attempting to formulate EPTP strategies for meeting local needs.

While recognizing that LEA-EPTP cooperation in assessing needs has been historically troubled for a variety of reasons related to data collection and sharing, we strongly believe that coordination in this area is possible and necessary for EPTP success. With this in mind, we urge EPTP staff to place significant effort on assisting LEAs to strengthen their base data on ESL and bilingual education by pooling all available information from SEAs, MRCs, and other Title VII programs in the service area. We also suggest that EPTPs work with OBEMLA to define programmatic roles and responsibilities under Title VII in the area of assessing needs.

1.3.2 Recruitment. Opportunities for EPTP-LEA coordination in the area of recruitment abound, simply because students in local high schools, their teachers, and their administrators form an obvious and appropriate pool of candidates for selection into the EPTP. By working closely with LEAs, EPTPs --even those newly funded--can significantly reduce difficulties in identifying and recruiting the numbers of students required to fill their enrollment capacities. Some specific activities for coordination in recruiting EPTP students from LEAs are offered below:

- *Work with LEA personnel offices to identify teachers and other educational personnel who serve LEP students but lack specific training and/or certification in bilingual education and ESL*: These inservice educators are likely to welcome opportunities to develop professional skills in working with the LEP population;
- *Jointly arrange career workshops for high school students participating in upward bound and student leadership programs to develop their awareness of professional opportunities in bilingual education and ESL*: Such activities not only build support for the profession as a whole, they may also serve to attract graduating students into undergraduate EPTPs;
- *Involve representatives from LEAs in the EPTP applicant screening process, and ask each LEA to name a contact person to act as a facilitator for EPTP recruitment*: This type of coordination builds interpersonal rapport as well as credibility for the EPTP;
- Through the LEA, identify community and social service agencies that might be helpful in recruiting non-traditional students for the EPTP; and,
- Encourage LEA Parent Advisory Councils (PACs) to assist in recruiting students to the EPTP.

Recruitment activities offer rich opportunities for informing a broad cross-section of community members about EPTPs and for involving them in EPTP operations--both outcomes can help garner community support for the EPTP. Because coordination in this area carries such importance, we suggest that recruitment efforts be carefully documented, monitored, and restructured, if necessary, based on records on the source of referral for each EPTP applicant and EPTP participant.

We also suggest that more funding be appropriated to EPTPs for coordination of recruitment activities with LEAs. As mentioned previously, the successful establishment and maintenance of cooperative working relationships require intensive amounts of time and attention from EPTP personnel.

1.3.3 Field experience/placement. To provide EPTP students with the most pertinent field exposure and to ensure that EPTP students

will be prepared to work effectively in local school settings, it is critical that LEAs and EPTPs collaborate in designing field experience programs. It is equally important to work jointly in placing students in the field, matching placements and students to the advantage of both agencies. Because EPTP educators are most familiar with the unique skills, talents, and personal traits of their students and LEA staff know well the needs and demands of particular schools and educational programs, joint efforts in the area of field experience/placement are a natural and logical extension of overall LEA-EPTP coordination activities.

To coordinate field experience programs, we strongly suggest that the LEAs and EPTP establish one or more committees, chaired jointly by an EPTP and LEA representative to accomplish the following:

- Design syllabi for field work that are developed on the basis of current research and that are compatible with the LEAs' educational philosophies and needs;
- Assign EPTP students to appropriate field placements, considering both the student's and the field's characteristics; and,
- Develop informative documentation and evaluation systems that can elicit feedback from all relevant participants in the field experience program. Student perceptions of their placements, supervising teacher assessments of the students' skills and additional training needs, and coordinator perspectives on the strengths and weaknesses of the program --all can assist EPTPs in working with LEAs to design mutually-beneficial field training experiences for students.

While we acknowledge that LEAs frequently lack sufficient personnel resources to participate actively in coordinating EPTP field programs, we strongly recommend that EPTPs take initiative in facilitating LEA contributions to these activities and that EPTPs stress benefits to LEAs of collaboration in fieldwork coordination.

1.3.4 Parent involvement/advisory council. Parents of LEA students, in general, and LEA Parent Advisory Councils (PACs), in particular, can provide valuable insight to EPTPs. They represent powerful stakeholders in the development of educational program philosophies and foci. Unfortunately, parental roles with respect to EPTPs (and, in many cases, with respect to LEAs) are not clearly defined or understood. As a result, the resources parents can offer to LEA and EPTP coordination are frequently underutilized.

Our concept of parent involvement--where parents serve as advisors to educational programs, participate in programmatic practice, and act as models in the learning process for children in the home--leads us to believe that EPTPs should take a proactive stance working with PACs.

EPTPs can offer LEAs assistance in:

(1) Defining the purposes for and responsibilities associated with parental involvement;
(2) Designing and implementing appropriate parent training programs;
(3) Identifying parents to participate in PACs and training programs; and,
(4) Developing feedback mechanisms for evaluating EPTP-LEA-Parent coordination.

In return, EPTPs can benefit from increased input from the community to guide program development and from increased exposure that breeds program support.

From this perspective we suggest that EPTPs work closely with LEAs and their PACs to:

- Delineate the roles, responsibilities, and needs of parents for participation in the educational process;
- Design systematic courses of study to increase parent awareness of and skills for participation in the educational process; and,
- Develop effective channels for disseminating information on local programs and on innovative or exemplary educational efforts in other school districts and IHEs, for example, by cosponsoring radio announcements and programs or copublishing newsletters.

In conclusion, we hold that EPTPs can, should, and must coordinate with LEAs to design and implement personnel training programs responsive to local needs. In our discussion we have acknowledged some barriers to effective EPTP-LEA collaboration, but more important, we have tried to suggest promising methods and strategies for building strong EPTP-LEA partnerships. We firmly maintain that such partnerships not only benefit the participating agencies, but also ultimately respond to the needs of children, our target beneficiaries.

1.4 Other Title VII and non-Title VII resources. When we began our discussions, EPTP directors in our group generally felt that coordination with other Title-VII resources was of low priority to themselves personally, to their projects, and to their institutions. However, in exploring the services offered by the Multifunctional Resource Centers (MRCs), the Evaluation Assessment Centers (EACs), and the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE), our group's EPTP members reflected on the wealth of information, expertise, and resources available through these service centers that could interface and support educational personnel training efforts. The group concluded that significant benefit could be realized through coordination with other Title VII Resources.

As we analyzed the various structures, some limitations were identified in the service centers' scopes of work that inhibit

coordination between EPTPs and these other Title VII projects. For instance, under the current EAC contracts, no provision is made for service delivery to EPTPs. Without technical assistance, it is difficult for EPTPs to disseminate accurate information on EAC services to trainees and to LEAs. In the same way, the sixteen MRCs each have unique contracts and scopes of work. Lacking formal, individualized MRC-EPTP communication channels, information exhange and dissemination becomes subject to error and misrepresentation. While we realize that Title VII services focus on provision of services to language minority students in local schools, we assert that IHE-based EPTPs are ultimately responsible for what occurs in local bilingual and ESL classrooms. For this reason, we believe there should be a reconceptualization of the Title VII service network and the IHE relationship: (1) the Title VII service network should be extended to assist EPTPs, and (2) the Title VII service centers should be encouraged to utilize expertise available in EPTP personnel.

Regarding EPTP coordination with non-Title VII resources, it appears that, at present, networking activities can serve outreach purposes most productively. Furthermore, we feel that coordination efforts should be targeted primarily toward awareness-raising. Given the current political climate which favors 'English-Only', EPTPs can direct their work with local community organizations toward informing the public about the goals, methods, and rationales associated with bilingual education and ESL instruction. In addition, EPTPs can build support for program activities by networking with the educational community through professional organizations.

From these points of view, we present below brief statements of goals that can be achieved through coordination with other Title VII and non-Title VII resources. Where appropriate, we will also note specific goals and limitations that currently may impede coordination with various subgroups.

1.4.1 MRCs. The major purpose to be served through EPTP coordination with MRCs is ensuring that services to LEAs are provided by the appropriate entity. The MRC scopes of work provide most fully for inservice training to educators, while EPTPs work more with preservice educational personnel training. Because both agencies respond to training needs identified at the local level, it is only logical that the two should work together to provide required training services; particulary when LEAs require both pre-and inservice technical support. By joining forces to identify local needs and to implement appropriate training programs, MRCs and EPTPs can maximize their effectiveness in serving LEAs. Related to this major goal are beliefs that MRCs can strengthen EPTP capacity for providing services to LEAs. At the same time, we note that EPTPs can facilitate MRC training activities, given the expertise available in project faculty members. We would suggest that the following coordination efforts could be undertaken by MRCs:

- Share effective strategies for conveying state-of-the art knowledge in content and successful methodologies for in service teacher training with EPTPs;
- Conduct informational programs for EPTP trainees; and,
- Act as a resource for recruiting EPTP students.

1.4.2 EACs. Our overriding purposes in coordinating EAC and EPTP activities would be to share principles of evaluation and to establish a forum for exchanging innovate concepts for evaluation in bilingual and ESL education. In addition, such coordination would enhance our understanding of EAC goals and activities and avail EPTPs of expertise needed to conduct productive evaluations of project training efforts. Furthermore, through coordination, EPTPs could disseminate information on EACs services to future bilingual and ESL educators.

In order to accomplish these goals and objectives, we realize that EAC regulations must be modified to provide for service delivery to EPTPs and to encourage inclusion of EPTPs in information dissemination efforts. For the present, we believe that OBEMLA could improve EPTP coordination with EACs by bringing representatives from EPTPs, EACs, SEAs, and MRCs together to examine available evaluation models and to discuss promising alternatives with reference to training services and to local education programs.

1.4.3 NCBE. Unfortunately the current regulations for operation of NCBE do not include extensive coordination with EPTPs. As a result, valuable opportunities for information sharing have been undermined. From the EPTP perspective, a centralized point for information has been lost; for NCBE, important sources for research literature and publications are no longer immediately accessible. For these reasons, we strongly recommend that NCBE services be enlarged and funded adequately to directly coordinate with and provide technical assistance to EPTPs in post-secondary institutions, as was previously the case.

1.4.4 OBEMLA. Our basic goal for coordinating with OBEMLA focuses on developing a nationally accepted understanding of bilingual education/ESL teacher training at the IHE level. To begin, we believe that we must work toward informing the federal staff about the realities of academic governance in IHEs and about educational research and paradigms. Concern is felt among us that OBEMLA staff does not fully appreciate EPTP budgetary needs, cost recovery needs, or needs for tenure-tracking of, at least, EPTP management by home IHEs to improve potential for program institutionalization. Thoughtful revision of regulations for EPTPs, in these areas, could greatly enhance success in both short- and long-term program operations. To increase understanding of EPTP functions in

OBEMLA and to improve OBEMLA-EPTP coordination, we would suggest that OBEMLA consider following activities:

- Issue a contract for developing a national IHE plan for bilingual education in teacher training (this plan should focus not on data collection, but on development of a vision);
- Include targeted presentations in the areas of IHE academic governance and research paradigms for educational personnel training during the Title VII management institution;
- Differentiate between new and experienced EPTP grantees in providing management assistance; and,
- Continue (and expand) site visit activities for EPTPs, with timely and comprehensive reviews, in order to better understand the needs of teacher-trainees and teacher training programs.

These activities--if undertaken in conjunction with EPTP information sharing--could lead to improvements in EPTP-OBEMLA communication and in EPTP capacities to improve training services.

1.4.5 Community organizations. As stated previously, we believe that the focus of attention for EPTP coordination with community organizations must emerge from local contexts. Goals must be jointly established and activites directed toward those goals must be designed collaboratively by community members and EPTP personnel. In general, however, we would suggest that coordination efforts on the part of EPTPs might most productively aim toward raising awareness through the media and in business, political, and 'grassroots' groups regarding the purposes, methodologies, and rationales for bilingual and ESL educational services.

1.4.6 Educational organizations. Our essential goal in coordinating with educational organizations is to promote awareness and national acceptance of bilingual education. Two basic types of educational organizations exist through which we, as a group, can attempt to inform other educators and the general public about our efforts, namely, professional membership organizations and private foundations. By becoming actively involved in professional organizations--such as AERA, ASCD, NABE, and TESOL--we gain both informal and formal opportunities to share our ideas, opinions, and expertise with colleagues. Informal networking is available through conference attendence, which can provide an excellent opportunity to establish rapport with educators not working directly with bilingual education. Equally, we can undertake formal communication activities by contributing articles to the organizations' journals and newsletters and by making presentations at the organizations' conferences.

In coordinating with the second type of educational organization, private foundations, we would hope for support in developing position

papers and reports on bilingual education and bilingual/ESL educational personnel training, akin to the recent Holmes Group and Carnegie Foundation reports on the future of teacher education in the U.S. By building linkages with respected private foundations, EPTPs may acquire not only monies needed to undertake public outreach activities but also access to influential policy-making forums.

We add a note of caution with respect to pursuing these goals and activities in coordination with educational organizations. Our primary attention must focus on management of our Title VII projects. We must be careful to avoid overextending ourselves when assuming public outreach roles because (1) we are only human with only twenty-four hours in the day, and (2) our activities could be misinterpreted in a political climate not favorable to bilingual education. Nevertheless, we hold that careful and thoughtful communication through vehicles available in educational organizations can help to promote acceptance, and thereby, success for EPTPs and other Title VII projects.

1.4.7 Future discussions regarding coordination. In our two days of discussion, we learned a great deal from each other. In particular, we arrived at a better understanding of resources currently available through Title VII service centers and of their designated scopes of work. We believe, however, that EPTPs would benefit from continued discussion in the future and that a two-day period does not provide sufficient opportunity to explore, in depth, issues that face EPTPs. With this in mind, we suggest that our next meetings as a group should place priority on examining philosphies of educational personnel training and the quality of training currently available in EPTPs. In so doing, we must continue to pursue topics introduced in this colloquium, with particular attention to the following themes:

- *Certification*: Recognizing that licensing processes vary greatly from state to state, with no consistency regarding requirements for bilingual education and ESL personnel, we feel that EPTPs and SEAs must meet to agree upon standard competencies for practicing in this field.
- *Internal coordination*: EPTPs have suffered from limited integration with existing IHE programs. We believe that this problem can and should be addressed, possibly by including non-EPTP, IHE personnel in future working sessions.
- *Institutionalization*: Related to the issue of internal coordination, issues of institutionalization must be further explored with IHE administrations to ensure program continuation and adoption.
- *LEA-EPTP Relationships*: This colloquium has addressed the topic of EPTP-LEA coordination, but not intrinsic relationships between the two entities. We sugggest that, in future meetings, time be allocated to examine systematically models of LEA and EPTP linkage.

- *Areas of Need*: In particular, we believe that EPTP educators must closely explore the field of bilingual special education. While much literature exists addressing topics in bilingual special education, the needed skills and competencies required for educational personnel working with LEP children with special needs are not yet fully understood.

With continued opportunities to meet as a group and to exchange information on both the topics covered in this working session and topics to be introduced in the future, we expect that EPTP educators will come to a collective understanding of the roles and underlying philosophies governing training of personnel to work with language minority children.

2. Institutionalization

This section of the colloquium proceedings addresses issues in EPTP institutionalization. Like the area of coordination, the notion of 'institutionalization' is frequently discussed in reference to federally-funded programs. The concept, however, cannot be described as a series of steps in a linear process. For a project to become institutionalized, it must be adopted, nurtured, and eventually assumed by the IHE that initially sought funding for it. EPTP institutionalization has occurred when the IHE no longer perceives the project as a separate entity.

The process of institutionalization, therefore, assumes that EPTPs must, over time, make their presence known throughout the IHE community and inform relevant stakeholders (IHE administrators, SEAs. LEAs, and the public) of project contributions. They must, equally, be designed to support prevailing philosophies and purposes of the home IHE. When EPTPs demonstrate, over time, contributions serving the goals and missions espoused by an IHE, they will be absorbed by the home institutions.

Discussions of themes regarding EPTP institutionalization indicated that no single set of prescriptive strategies can assist institutionalization processes. Small groups agreed that each EPTP is designed to respond to unique needs in the IHE, state, local, and community context--each EPTP must implement institutionalization strategies that respond to its environment.

At the same time, EPTP directors participating in the small groups treating issues of institutionalization agreed that:

- Placement of EPTP staff in tenure-track positions is critical for program continuance;
- Student enrollment levels for EPTPs seriously affect project institutionalization;
- Coordination with and involvement of faculty members outside the project can facilitate project longevity; and,
- EPTPs must negotiate for adequate funds from federal and home IHE sources to meet project goals initially, and to sustain achievement of project goals over time.

While colloquium participants appreciated successes enjoyed by their peers in institutionalizing EPTPs, they also realized that EPTPs must continue to work for the status of fully recognized educational programs.

Four small groups of colloquium participants treated issues of institutionalization. The first group dealt with the area of staff and faculty resources. The group's report begins with an analysis of instructional components necessary for an EPTP, which drives EPTP staffing needs. The report focuses next on various topics involving EPTP faculty: (1) attracting qualified staff, (2) orienting new staff to the home IHE, (3) EPTP staff professional development efforts, (4) strategies for retaining EPTP staff, and (5) methods for providing administrative support to EPTP faculties. The group's report closes with recommendations for strengthening EPTPs.

The second small group working on EPTP institutionalization addressed topics in inter- and intra-departmental coordination. This group first outlined conditions that must be present for project integration within an IHE, then proceeded to link integration processes with institutionalization processes in the following areas: (1) course development and cataloguing, (2) degree program and curriculum development, (3) student advising, and (4) student progress monitoring.

The third 'institutionalization' group probed issues of student characteristics and recruitment for EPTPs. This group began by identifying sources of diversity among EPTPs and in this framework, identified sources of diversity in student populations served by EPTPs. The group then offered extensive discussion of issues in (1) student recruitment, (2) student selection criteria, (3) EPTP language proficiency requirements, (4) program academic standards, and (5) student retention.

The fourth small group explored topics of EPTP budget planning and cost assumption. The group opened with a statement that drives the remainder of its report, specifically, 'If EPTPs are to be institutionalized, EPTP budgeting functions must be intimately tied into EPTP administrative frameworks, with responsibilities for budget management clearly delineated, delegated, and coordinated.' The group proceeded to offer guidelines and strategies for both novice and experienced EPTP directors to hone effective budget management skills.

Throughout the four groups' discussions and reports, agreement emerged that EPTPs can be institutionalized. The process is a complex one. Each director must analyze the unique context under which a given EPTP operates and devise institutionalization strategies that respond to that context. Nonetheless, with careful planning and perseverance, EPTPs will become part and parcel program offerings of the home IHE.

The consensus reports from the small groups discussing institutionalization follow.

2.1 Staff and faculty resources. Preparing competent personnel for bilingual and ESL education has presented a challenge to teacher training institutions. On the one hand, shortages of qualified personnel for language-minority students in local schools have been widely reported. Obviously, concerted efforts must be undertaken to increase the size of the educator pools for language minority students. On the other hand, however, training institutions must ensure that graduates are well qualified to assume responsibilities for educating language-minority students. The challenge in supplying skillful personnel to local schools is clear. Success in rising to this challenge lies largely in institutional capabilities to attract, retain, and fully utilize faculty for EPTP projects.

A number of topics recurred as we discussed the role of faculty and staff in EPTP institutionalization. First, as a group, we had to agree on the necessary configuration of a bilingual/ESL educator training program, since the content of an educational program dictates its faculty requirements. We came to the consensus that bilingual/ESL training, like other educator training programs, should consist of the following three components:

(1) *General academic development coursework*: courses and experiences which develop a broad base of world knowledge in trainees;
(2) *Academic specialization coursework*: courses and experiences that cultivate areas of specialization in trainees; and,
(3) *Professional education coursework*: courses and experiences that prepare trainees to succeed in educational careers.

In addition, we believe that EPTP trainees should be required to demonstrate proficiency in English and in another language.

Having defined these critical components of an effective EPTP, we agreed that specialized training for language-minority educators must be integrated with university course offerings, such that EPTP participants are exposed to instructors from a variety of departments within the institution.

At the same time, we realized that the university community could benefit from inclusion of EPTP faculty in cross-disciplinary course offerings. By hiring specialists in bilingual education and ESL to fill vacancies in the permanent staff, students in many departments can be apprised of the needs of language-minority populations; and opportunities for EPTP institutionalization can be enhanced by the presence of tenure-track faculty.

In this vein, we strongly suggest that LEAs, SEAs, tenured IHE departmental staffs, and EPTPs coordinate efforts in identifying and nominating persons for faculty positions. By involving persons with varied perspectives (from the above-mentioned groups and also parent, community, private sector, and federal representatives) on EPTP search and screening committees, projects not only broaden their pools of qualified and flexible faculty candidates; they also

increase their potential for developing working relationships with agents influential in their success.

With this preface, our group unanimously agreed that the following steps should be taken in order to institutionalize EPTPs by bringing EPTP faculty into IHE communities:

- Design innovative strategies for recruiting and retaining bilingual instructors for IHE faculty positions in disciplines where language-minority instructors have been traditionally underrepresented;
- Develop communication and support networks for bilingual and language-minority faculty, by establishing mentor systems within the home university and across post-secondary institutions to assist these staff members in moving into key IHE administrative positions and/or in achieving permanent faculty status;
- Promote staff development within the home institution by encouraging non-EPTP faculty to explore issues in bilingual and ESL education, by prodding IHEs to provide research funds to EPTP faculty members, and by ensuring the availability of resources for EPTP faculty participation in professional and academic conferences;
- Review tenure and promotion criteria established by home IHEs to ensure that the requirements will be clearly understood by incoming faculty and that the criteria are relevant to EPTP needs; and,
- Build EPTP faculty visibility by acting as sources of substantive, research-based information on language-minority education for key policy-makers and administrators.

With these comprehensive strategies in mind, we present below goals and activities associated with EPTP staff recruitment, development, and retention for the purposes of EPTP institutionalization.

2.1.1 Attracting qualified staff. The success and longevity of an EPTP rely greatly on the strength of its instructional personnel. Projects build credibility and support by demonstrating that they contribute to the overall IHE mission--shown, in part, through the addition of talented new faculty to the IHE community. However, EPTPs have historically experienced difficulties in hiring skilled instructors for two major reasons. First, EPTP positions have laced security, when funded by 'soft monies' (that is, through project budget rather than IHE budget allocations). Second, EPTPs themselves have sometimes lacked prestige within an IHE--perceived as short-lived, 'stepchild', or isolated projects not integrated into standard IHE program offerings. Highly qualified educator-trainers may be hesitant to associate themselves with projects that are held in low esteem by the professional community.

Nonetheless, we believe that competent EPTP staffs can be assembled if each position is made sufficiently attractive to talented post-secondary instructors. Furthermore, we believe that a competent staff must be assembled if EPTPs are to meet the training needs of educators serving language-minority students.

From this perspective, we suggest the following broad strategies for attracting qualified staff to EPTP positions:

- Increase staff security by convincing the IHE to fund positions with 'hard monies' from the institution's operating budgeting, and to place EPTP faculty members on tenure-tracks;
- Improve EPTP stability for staff by integrating project services with IHE programs overall and by offering EPTP faculty opportunities to work with students from the entire IHE student body, not just project trainees; and,
- Build EPTP credibility in the eyes of professionals by ensuring that graduation requirements are at least as rigorous as those of the IHE, by increasing curriculum focus on academic content specializations, and by including language and content testing in entrance and exit screening criteria for trainees.

Together these strategies produce both extrinsic (job security and promotion opportunities) and intrinsic (prestige and access to a cross-section of students) incentives for professionals considering EPTP staff positions. They do not however, guarantee that candidates applying for EPTP positions are adequately qualified to meet the needs of project trainees. For this reason, we strongly recommend that faculty candidates be carefully screened through both interview and credential-review procedures. In addition, we advise that faculty recruitment and selection procedures be monitored regularly to ensure that they, in fact, attract the most competent educators and identify from that pool the personnel best suited to the particular characteristics of individual EPTPs.

2.1.2 Faculty orientation. As suggested above, each EPTP is unique by virtue of its setting, target trainee population, an educational focus and philosophy. Even highly experienced educators coming into EPTPs will require assistance in understanding and adjusting to the requirements of the new position. For this reason, we feel that EPTPs must provide thorough orientations for new faculty members to acquaint them with the institution, the project, and associated personnel. In addition, thoughtful orientation programs can help to develop a sense of unity in project faculty, be reiterating project goals and student population needs.

Two basic strategies emerge for implementing appropriate orientation activities. First, EPTPs should hold project faculty meetings and less formal gatherings that allow members to become familiar with each other. Second, EPTPs should initiate or participate in IHE-wide faculty assemblies where new staff members can be

formally introduced to the IHE professional staff and where information on project progress can be disseminated.

2.1.3 Staff development. Basically, the purposes of staff development in EPTPs are two-fold: (1) to encourage faculty to pursue professional growth, and (2) to develop faculty understanding of the student body and its needs such that student learning will be enhanced. Traditional methods for providing staff development are appropriate for EPTP faculty and may include workshops, presentations by invited speakers, and support for faculty travel, research, and sabbaticals. The latter activities, in particular, can benefit the EPTP as a whole, if individual educators are afforded opportunities to share newly gained insights with the entire faculty. At the very last, educators supported in independent professional growth opportunities should be asked to document their experiences for their purposes of both information dissemination and evaluation of staff development efforts.

Furthermore, we believe that EPTP staff development activities should include non-EPTP faculty in the IHE to promote the exchange of state-of-the-art techniques across disciplines and to cultivate understanding of language-minority education goals and methods.

Unfortunately, we realize that funding and time limitations have traditionally inhibited EPTP staff development efforts. We hope that improved documentation of staff development outcomes, in the form of reports on various types of activities, will attract increased resources for future staff development undertakings.

We would also like to note that structured and comprehensive staff development efforts contribute to success in EPTP faculty retention, the topic of the next section.

2.1.4 Faculty retention/tenuring. EPTP institutionalization requires not only the presence of competent staff, but also stability in the staff over time. Effective strategies for keeping qualified staff members with the EPTP must be identified and implemented. A prominent and frequently cited mechanism for holding EPTP educators is tenure: Professionals justifiably want to know that their positions will be secure from year to year; they expect institutions to acknowledge their contributions by assuring them of continued employment. Equally, however, EPTP educators desire recognition for their achievements and opportunities to develop as professionals. With strong leadership from a highly qualified director, EPTPs can increase staff retention by pushing the IHE to assume responsibility for project staff maintenance, to reward outstanding staff members, and to support professional growth activities undertaken by EPTP staff members.

2.1.5 Administrative and faculty support. The issues associated with administrative and faculty support for EPTP institutionalization evoke a sense that the concepts of language-minority education and

educator training must achieve acceptance throughout IHE faculty and administrations. To gain such acceptance, EPTPs must develop and implement plans to inform the IHE community about bilingual education, ESL, and rationales and methods used to train educators serving language-minority students. The task is formidable and difficult to handle within a single project. Thus, we believe that (1) projects must work together to design outreach and awareness-raising activities targeting parents, community groups, and the private sector, in addition to IHE personnel; and (2) OBEMLA should assume a leadership role informing the post-secondary education communities about the purposes of federal bilingual education legislation. With reference to efforts OBEMLA could undertake to improve support for EPTPs, we recommend that OBEMLA should:

- Assume a stronger position advocating projects in bilingual education, as well as English language development;
- Develop brochures for dissemination to professional and service organizations providing information on bilingual education, in general, and on available grants; and,
- Preface its grant announcements in the *Federal Register* and other publications with a statement that clearly conveys the intentions of legislation and funding allocations for improving educational services for language-minority populations.

In closing, we would like to voice our belief that this Colloquium represents an effort on the part of OBEMLA to enlist the resources of IHEs in educating language-minority persons. We would also hope to urge OBEMLA to follow up this session with planned meetings that will allow us to pursue a higher level of understanding in the field of bilingual education and educator training.

2.2 Inter-/Intra-departmental coordination. Our group unanimously agreed that 'politicking', public relations, and alliance formation within the IHE are activities essential for EPTP survival and institutionalization. Project longevity depends on its being perceived as an asset to the IHE. Therefore, EPTPs must become integrated with the whole structure of an IHE, rather than operating as isolated projects.

EPTP integration with the IHE, and by extension, institutionalization within the IHE, is possible when the follow conditions are present:

- *The IHE demonstrates commitment to EPTP maintenance* by:
  - allocating funds for the project from its budget for materials and staff;
  - placing project faculty in tenure or tenure-track positions, according prestige and recognized status to EPTP staff;
  - agreeing to absorb staff salaries over time; and/or

    - convening interdisciplinary advisory and advocacy committees to guide EPTP development and build support for the project;
- *Non-EPTP faculty members actively show support for the project* by:
    - attending bilingual education and ESL training activities;
    - teaching courses offered through the EPTP, or team-teaching such courses;
    - inviting EPTP educators to teach or team-teach courses offered through their departments; and/or,
    - participating in advisory and advocacy groups for the EPTP.
- *EPTP management and monitoring functions are spread across university staff members*: For EPTP longevity, no single person can hold control over the project. Rather, ownership and responsibility must be diversified throughout the IHE structure;
- *Credit-hour generation and enrollment levels justify project maintenance*: Programs without sufficient enrollments cease operations;
- *The project mission, philosophy, and priorities are compatible with the mission, philosophy and priorities of the home IHE*, in areas such as research, instructional methods, and focus for undergraduate and graduate education.

To create conditions for project institutionalization, we address various areas of focus for inter- and intra-department coordination in the sections that follow.

2.2.1 Course development/cataloguing. Development of coursework to accommodate the training needs of educators serving language-minority populations represents a first step in designing EPTPs. EPTP course development also can lay the groundwork for interdepartmental cooperation if curriculum designers tap expertise available in related departmental faculties and avoid duplication of courses similar in content offered by existing programs. With this in mind, we recommend that EPTP planners work with cross-disciplinary faculties to modify existing courses rather than develop new courses. For instance, instead of devising a new course on Hispanic children's literature, a unit on Hispanic literature might be added to an institutionalized children's literature course. This would not only serve the needs of educators working with native Spanish-speaking students, it would also increase cultural sensitivity in teacher-trainees from the larger IHE student body.

Second, if the development of a new course is deemed necessary, we would advise EPTP planners to work with established departmental faculty to design the course in order to acquire content area expertise

while developing specific bilingual education or English language development learning objectives.

Third, we suggest that EPTP directors introduce new courses as experimental courses (special topics or pilot courses) open to all members of the student body. This strategy increases IHE student exposure to the concepts of bilingual education and provides to EPTP trainees the broad range of perspectives and insights brought to a course by student peers from other programs.

Fourth, we would advise EPTPs to seek faculty qualified to teach courses in non-EPTP specific disciplines. EPTP staff members teaching in other departments can share bilingual/ESL philosophies with both faculty and students by including units on language-minority cultures and educational needs in courses offered through other IHE programs.

We also would like to point out that the utility and effectiveness of courses taken by EPTP trainees should be regularly and systematically monitored. Student formal and informal course evaluations, course content reviews conducted by external evaluators, and comparisons of course syllabi with LEA and SEA competency requirements and syllabi used for courses in other EPTPs--all can assist EPTP managers in judging the quality of project-sponsored coursework and in revising project courses, if necessary.

Finally, we remind EPTP managers that our projects should offer structured programs, not a litany of unrelated courses. Although EPTPs are frequently housed apart from relevant departments and limits exist in faculty cross-disciplinary expertise; we must, nonetheless, attempt to work with our institutions to devise academically sound courses that progressively lead toward specific and identifiable goals. We explore this concept further in the next section.

2.2.2 Degree program/curriculum development. As EPTP directors, our goals in designing curriculum for degree or credential programs include:

(1) Development of programs that meet state certification requirements, university expectations, and community needs for language-minority educators; and
(2) Integration of project courses of study with all areas of the IHE curriculum.

To accomplish these goals, we realize that we must:

- Define the relationship between our projects and (1) the IHE mission and philosophies and (2) parent and community expectations, by involving representatives from other departments, parents, and community organizations in designing EPTP programs;
- Develop programs that will be approved by relevant authorities, by providing written proposals for their inspection

and by establishing productive rapport with appropriate authorizing agents; and

- Implement strategies that encourage faculty from other departments to teach EPTP courses and EPTP faculty to teach outside the project. This strategy builds support for the program itself and for bilingual/ESL educator training, in general.

To investigate the efficacy of EPTP degree program plans, we suggest that ongoing monitoring activities be implemented to plot student progress patterns, to encourage self-study (possibly through annually scheduled staff retreats), and to involve external experts from other IHE departments, from licensing agent such as SEA, and from external evaluation centers.

While we recognize that EPTPs must battle against fiscal constraints and deficiencies in IHE and community commitments to efforts to institutionalize degree and credentialing programs, we believe that comprehensive coordination and communication strategies can mitigate these impediments to success.

2.2.3 Student advising. As mentioned in our opening statement, we realize that maintained levels of student enrollment are powerful predictors of project institutionalization potential. A priority for EPTPs, therefore, is provision of student advisory services adequate to ensure that students enrolled in the program will complete the program. To achieve this goal, we suggest that EPTPs:

- *Construct systems for advising students* by reviewing procedures implemented in programs noted for academic success, with specific attention to the materials used by successful programs to recruit and screen prospective trainees;
- *Involve all IHE counseling personnel--not just the EPTP staff --in advising and scheduling students*: This strategy not only brings a broad base of expertise to EPTP trainee advisement, it also ensures project visibility and coordination within the IHE. At the same time, the strategy requires that all participating faculty-advisors be trained in cross-cultural counselling or receive training in cross-cultural awareness;
- *Consider both the cultural background and counselling expertise of faculty candidates in hiring staff for advisory positions*;
- *Develop manuals for new trainees stating the requirements for entry to the IHE and for program completion*: Orientation for new trainees should also advise them of ethnic and peer support groups active on the campus, assign them a peer EPTP, and provide information on available financial, study skills, and tutorial assistance programs; and
- *Credit trainees for prior educational experience and expertise in developing individual program plans.*

Our discussions in the area of student progress monitoring expand upon the concepts we espouse for trainee advisement, as presented in the next section.

2.2.4 Student progress monitoring. Monitoring trainee progress through EPTPs not only assists directors in gauging project success and modifying project activities to respond to changing student needs, it also provides an opportunity to help trainees to meet their personal academic goals. Our group discussions focused on the latter purpose for student progress monitoring and the following suggestions were generated for supporting students throughout their EPTP experience and for encouraging program completion in a four- to five-year period are to:

- Construct mechanisms to identify students with special needs or difficulties early in their EPTP enrollment and to provide these students with individualize plans or tutorials designed to assist them in overcoming problems before considering dropping out of the program; and,
- Schedule regular appointments with trainees to review their progress, to revise individual academic plans in accordance with the trainee's needs, and to guide trainees toward coursework most likely to serve their needs.

In facilitating student progress through EPTPs, we suggest that projects attentively monitor needs for the addition of test-taking skills training and tutorial components to their programs and that projects evaluate their success in preparing graduates who meet or surpass competency-based requirements.

In conclusion, we would like to request that OBEMLA support our effort for institutionalization by providing management training for new Title VII EPTP directors, and inservice management skill development for experienced EPTP personnel.

2.3 Recognition of student characteristics and student recruitment. In beginning our discussions, we assumed that EPTPs were fairly similar in focus and design. We soon discovered, however, that each EPTP was unique and that great diversity existed across programs. Among the many areas of variability exhibited across projects are emphases placed on language proficiency, that is, some projects employ raters certified by national language testing agencies, while others accept student self-reports or study abroad as evidence of trainee language skills. Furthermore, not all projects offer professional coursework in the target language for classroom instruction; and there are projects that provide for second language communicative skill development only through the IHE foreign or modern language departments. In discovering the variations among our own EPTPs, we realized that each project design grows out of its unique setting, with consideration given to:

- *The needs of language minority children in local schools* (e.g., for Native-American children, bilingual programs may focus on native language restoration and renewal; while local programs for Southeast Asian refugee children may more heavily emphasize English language development);
- *SEA certification and licensure requirements*;
- *Characteristics of the trainee population to be served by an EPTP* (for example, in some cases, trainees may be truly bilingual in LEA community languages prior to enrolling in an EPTP; while in others, trainees may require intensive second language skill development as an integral component of their educator preparation); and,
- *Institutional capabilities of the home IHE*, particularly with regard to strengths in existing departments and programs.

These initial findings led the group to believe that, although some minimal standards for language proficiency should be adopted nationally to facilitate reciprocity agreements among states seeking to hire project graduates, flexibility and innovation should be exercised by individual EPTPs in designing recruitment procedures, selection criteria, language proficiency requirements, academic standards, and student retention strategies. We elaborate upon our suggestions in these areas in the sections that follow.

2.3.1 Student characteristics. Our discussions on the topic of student characteristics confirmed our suspicions that no 'typical' or prototype EPTP trainee exists. Aside from sharing interests in bilingual education and education for language minority populations, students in one EPTP may have little in common with students in another. Major areas of diversity across EPTP student bodies include:

- *Ethnolinguistic background of trainees*: EPTPs may serve U.S.-born, English-dominant students, students from sizable language/ethnic communities in the U.S. (e.g., Spanish- and Chinese-, or Vietnamese-speaking backgrounds), and/or students from ethnolinguistic backgrounds represented in relatively small numbers in the U.S. (for instance, Gujarati, Hamong, or the Ute nation of Native Americans);
- *Linguistic proficiencies of trainees*: EPTP trainees range from being fully bilingual in English and another language to having little or no proficiencies in English or in a second language;
- *Cross-cultural experience of trainees*: EPTP students may have monocultural backgrounds (possibly from living in homogenous communities in the U.S. or just recently emmigrating to the U.S.); they may come from bicultural backgrounds (e.g., from Mexican-American communities in the U.S. Southwest); or they may have acquired multicultural sensitivity through travel and living experience abroad;

- *Educational goals of trainees*: EPTP trainees may seek undergraduate or graduate teacher education degrees, they may wish to complete coursework required for certification, or they may be pursuing advanced study in a non-teaching educational specialty; and
- *Non-traditional characteristics of trainees*: EPTP participants may hold full-time professional positions or may have been homemakers now pursuing post-secondary training after children have grown.

Any EPTP must carefully consider these and other relevant characteristics of the target student population in order to design responsive academic programs, to develop strategies for student recruitment, and to devise support services that will assist students in meeting their personal educational goals. We also strongly advise that EPTPs undertake thorough need assessment studies prior to project implementation to ensure that sufficient numbers of potential trainees exist and are accessible for enrollment--not only in the first year of operation, but over time--such that project institutionalization is warranted.

2.3.2 Recruitment procedures. Our goal in discussing recruitment procedures was basically to identify strategies that enable EPTPs to identify and, more importantly, contact the population of potential trainees who meet project participation criteria. We found that as a group we were able to generate a sizable number of promising practices that serve this purpose and provide access to a wide variety of communication channels. Among our suggested activities for EPTP recruitment are to:

- Advertise for project applicants through public service announcements placed with local newspapers and television and radio stations;
- Distribute posters and flyers announcing program availability (with information on eligibility requirements, benefits, application deadlines, and a contact for further detail to LEAs, IHEs, and community agencies;
- Present information on program availability at local educational faculty meetings and relevant community events;
- Circulate applications and place them in strategic areas frequented by potential trainees (libraries, high school and IHE counselling and career offices, etc.);
- Participate in LEA annual 'Career Day';
- Visit on-campus teacher preparation classes to discuss bilingual education/ESL programs as well as coursework in multicultural education now required in many states;
- Recruit potential participants by coordinating information dissemination activities with student financial aid offices, IHE counselling services, and teacher education centers;

- Tap into student-to-student and other networks to share information on the program;
- Inform Title VII directors in the service area of program availability and ask them for referrals;
- For programs targeting Native Americans, employ Native Americans to perform student recruitment activities and to contact resource persons on reservations; contact potential candidates through door-to-door visitations and personal consultations; and inform tribal headquarters about the program;
- Solicit referrals from other educators through formal and informal channels, including:

  Formal channels:
  - IHE recruitment 'protocol' activities in high schools and other IHEs;
  - Program announcements in professional periodicals;
  - Special colloquia for high school minority counselors;

  Informal channels:
  - Dissemination of brochures to community ethnic associations and agencies and to LEAs, SEAs, and state-level associations at meetings, workshops, and seminars;
  - Provision of information to participants in advisory council meetings;
  - Informing IHE faculty on issues in bilingual education and ESL;
  - Participation in IHE, on-campus orientation and information sharing activities.

It is worthy of note that less formal recruitment efforts not only get information to potential trainees, but they also increase project visibility and, by extension, credibility. This is particularly important since EPTP recruitment strategies have been troubled in the past by factors such as:

- The absence of ethnolinguistic role models in some EPTP staffs;
- Prevailing attitudes in some ethnolinguistic communities that their youth are best served by vocational education programs;
- Weaknesses in IHE sensitivity to the needs of ethnolinguistic minority students;
- The passivity of EPTPs with reference to involvement in larger IHE teacher preparation efforts; and,
- Limited dissemination of information on programs targeting low incidence ethnolinguistic groups such as Gullah or Gujarati.

Given experiences with these traditional problems, we strongly advise EPTPs to exercise creativity and flexibility in developing recruitment and student outreach strategies. At the same time, recognizing that EPTPs have limited funds and resources, we suggest that EPTPs establish formal procedures for monitoring and evaluating the consequences of their various recruitment activities. Guidelines for monitoring evaluation should be developed with input from SEAs, NCATE and NASTEC, and should include, at least, mechanisms for maintaining records of the sources of inquiry referrals, for reviewing the records regularly to identify the most productive referral agents, and for modifying recruitment procedures to maximize their effectiveness based on the assessments.

Finally, we identified some issues that EPTP directors may wish to keep in mind when undertaking recruitment efforts:

(1) Tuition benefits may be insufficient incentives to attract talented minority students into EPTPs. Minority student access to lucrative professions outside education has increased tremendously, and aggressive campaigns to entice minority students into non-education IHE programs have proliferated. As such, EPTPs that highlight tuition provisions may draw the attentions of students seeking post-secondary degrees at no personal cost, rather than the attention of students with true commitment to working in education for language minority populations. EPTPs must carefully target recruitment efforts toward talented students, motivated to contribute to the bilingual education/ESL field.

(2) Mandated entry and exit testing requirements and/or perceived weaknesses in academic preparation may dissuade some otherwise-promising minority trainee-candidates from submitting applications for program participation. EPTPs should work toward implementing strategies to assist such candidates in test-taking and to provide 'total' education programs that provide tutorial or remedial assistance, as necessary.

2.3.3 Selection criteria. In the area of selection criteria, our group attempted to identify participant criteria that would both apply for all EPTPs and provide for the unique requirements associated with individual EPTPs. We will assume that EPTPs require potential candidates to complete applications for admission to both the home IHE and the project itself, including submission of relevant transcripts, recommendations, and other documentation. Below, we offer outlines of (1) the standards we feel should apply for all EPTPs (including, where applicable, sources of evidence for evaluation of applicant qualifications and commitment) and (2) additional factors in applicants' background and experience that may influence selection decisions in some EPTPs.

We believe that all EPTPs should consider the following aspects of applicant qualifications in selecting project participants.

- Eligibility for enrollment in existing IHE teacher education programs (using IHE standards);
- Strength of letters of recommendations submitted by the applicant;
- Performance in interviews conducted by project faculty members or the project director;
- Ability to write in English and in a target language (as judged through holistic assessments of writing samples or essays);
- Oral proficiency in English and in a target language (as assessed through formal or informal interview procedures); and
- Prior academic history (possession of a minimum G.P.A. of 2.5 in overall coursework or a higher G.P.A. in areas of graduate level specialization).

In addition, we recognize that the following factors may carry influence in participant selection for some EPTPs.

- Ethnolinguistic background--some EPTPs choose to show preference for minority students traditionally underrepresented in teacher-training programs (e.g., Native American applicants);
- Performance on examinations required for entry to undergraduate teacher education programs (such as the PPST);
- Prior experience in an area of focus for the EPTP;
- The applicant's level of need for financial assistance;
- Prior experience in living within an ethnolinguistic community targeted by the EPTP;
- Ability to meet any special scheduling requirements of the EPTP;
- Legal status in the U.S.; and,
- Other special skills an applicant might bring to the EPTP.

By tapping multiple sources of evidence--including all of the standard selection criteria we suggest for assessing applicant qualifications for EPTP participation--projects can circumvent problems that may arise if only isolated criteria dictate program eligibility. More specifically, we strongly recommend that projects *not* make selection decisions on the sole basis of financial need since this criterion in no way predicts student commitment to teaching in general and to LEP populations in particular. We caution EPTPs to avoid accepting applicants into the project prior to their acceptance to the IHE. Finally, we note that applicants may not perceive the language abilities as being important to EPTP participation. It is incumbent upon EPTP faculty to evaluate applicant language proficiencies in order to select candidates most qualified for the project.

To ensure that selection procedures fairly and accurately discriminate among more and less qualified applicants, we suggest that EPTPs regularly evaluate their screening mechanisms, accounting for (1) their effectiveness in filling project slots with participants with characteristics specified in the EPTP proposal and (2) trends in selected candidate rejections and acceptances of offers for EPTP participation. In addition, we would advise EPTPs to make all participant selection decisions through a committee, including the project director, given that committee decisions can help to prevent incidents of inadvertent favoritism.

2.3.4 Language proficiency requirements. In discussing the issue of language proficiency requirements for EPTP participants, our group attempted to identify criteria and suggested procedures for assessing language proficiencies of EPTP trainees upon entry to and exit from the program. As mentioned previously, our group members agreed that a minimum national standard for proficiency in both English and target languages for instruction should be adopted. Furthermore, we believe that both classroom interaction and academic language abilities, in addition to conversational competency, should be considered in assessing EPTP participant skills. EPTP participants' language facility should not only be tested through the use of oral and written examinations, they should also be evaluated through observation of the participants' use of English and target languages in classroom settings.

Through sharing practices used in our group members' projects, we identified the following language assessment strategies as being current among EPTPs:

- *Formal proficiency testing*: Proficiency tests are constructed to address all language skills--oral/aural abilities and literacy (where applicable--some languages do not have a written form). In general, attention is also given to language knowledge pertinent to various content areas and to the ethnolinguistic groups' cultural characteristics. In oral interviews, which may be conducted by an individual or a committee, examinees are often asked to discuss aspects of the target culture. The assessments are used not only to judge participant proficiency levels, but also to determine participant placement in target language coursework;
- *Acceptance of evidence that participants have gained proficiency through previous experience, or no requirements of proficiency in a second language upon entry to a program*;
- *Use of criteria and instrumentation adopted at the state-level for endorsement and/or certification of bilingual and ESL educators.* (Certification requirements for language proficiency assessors pose cost and availability problems for some EPTPs.)

Although we believe that rigorous language proficiency assessment of participants should be implemented in EPTPs, we would also like to point out technical problems that influence the accuracy of available assessment strategies. First, few instruments for measuring cultural knowledge exist. Those that do exist are of questionable validity. Second, in some programs, faculty members are not proficient in target languages for instruction. And, third, IHE models and foreign language courses generally do not focus on development of classroom or academic language skills, creating difficulties for students who need to improve their language skills in these areas.

2.3.5 Program academic standards. Our group's goal in exploring this issue was to establish program and student performance standards to ensure that EPTPs consistently produce competent education professionals. Again, we discovered that no single model could serve to guide standard-setting for all EPTPs. Rather, programmatic design must emerge in response to needs evident in the local, state, and IHE contexts with standards established in reference to the project objectives. While we feel it is appropriate to formulate course sequences that accommodate IHE requirements for degree programs and/or state specifications for certification and endorsement; we recognize that such requirements vary significantly from state to state and from IHE to IHE. Therefore, each EPTP must coordinate with relevant SEAs and with the home IHE to identify critical components to be included in its academic coverage.

Below, we outline program features common among effective EPTPs and offer some general suggestions for EPTP design:

- EPTPs develop specific course sequences that meet educator training needs identified for LEAs in the service area, state certification and/or endorsement specifications, and IHE degree-awarding program standards;
- EPTPs include practicum and field experience requirements in not only bilingual education and ESL areas, but also in relevant academic content areas. Such fieldwork is of sufficient duration to ensure that students develop needed skills and competencies and is supervised by qualified faculty. Unfortunately, provision of high-quality fieldwork for EPTP trainees can be problemmatic, because (1) the heavy workloads carried by bilingual and ESL faculty limit time available for supervision of trainees in the field, (2) distances between the IHE and field sites may be great--making frequent observations of trainee performance difficult, (3) locally based field supervisors may lack credentials or experience in bilingual education or ESL which limits their abilities to coach trainees in these areas, and (4) sufficient numbers of appropriate field placements in schools are not always available. EPTPs attempt to overcome these problem areas

through extensive coordination and collaboration with LEAs in the service area.

- For EPTPs that focus on bilingual educator training, some portion of the professional development courses is conducted in the target language to ensure that trainees gain proficiency in academic communication skills across languages.
- EPTPs utilize all available technical and auxiliary resources to supplement training programs and to provide specific assistance to trainees with identified deficiencies;
- EPTPs carefully assess qualifications of applicants prior to accepting students to the program (frequently using formal screening examinations such as the CTBS, the PPST, and the MAT). EPTPs monitor trainee performance in relation to minimal G.P.A. standards established for continuation in the project (ranging from 2.0 to 2.5 for general coursework, and from 2.5 to 3.0 in education courses). And EPTPs evaluate students once they have fulfilled course requirements (through oral and or written competency examinations) before awarding degrees and/or certification.

Certainly not very effective EPTP implements all of the quality indicators noted above. This listing of features common in successful EPTPs is intended only to offer examples of practices that support high quality training for bilingual education and ESL educators.

2.3.6 Retaining students. In this area, our group worked toward proposing strategies for preventing trainee attrition from EPTPs. In so doing, we identified three clusters of problem areas that my contribute to project dropout, given the unique characteristics of EPTP trainee groups, namely, cultural dysfunction, cognitive and linguistic academic demands, and scheduling. Below, we define each of these problem clusters, then propose strategies for mitigating the problems in order to improve EPTP trainee retention.

- *Cultural dysfunction*: EPTP students from ethnolinguistic minority backgrounds may have difficulty in adjusting to and working within IHE environments, particularly if they feel isolated or detached from the 'mainstream' IHE student population.

To alleviate culture conflicts trainees may experience, we suggest that EPTPs:

- Provide students with access to personal and academic counseling services and support systems (on- or off-campus) that can assist them in dealing with cultural discontinuity;
- Assign 'buddies' or peer mentors to new EPTP trainees, thereby, building support networks among project participants; and,

- Develop a sense of professional identity among program participants by facilitating their attendance at conferences and by eliciting their input to program development or modification to ensure that programs meet student needs.

- *Cognitive and linguistic academic demands*: Ethnolinguistic minority EPTP students may come from weak elementary and secondary educational background or encounter difficulties in handling coursework taught entirely in English (or through a language not native to them).

  To respond to these problem areas, EPTPs may plan to:
  - Provide tutorial and other support for academic and linguistic skill development, particularly in preparation for competency testing;
  - Maintain contact with non-EPTP faculty to monitor student performance in courses outside project offerings; and
  - Establish procedures for systematically monitoring each trainee's progress through the EPTP; convene the EPTP faculty regularly to review student progress and to devise intervention strategies for specific students, if necessary.

- *Scheduling*: Many EPTP trainees have full-time jobs and/or children, and for these reasons find it nearly impossible to attend classes offered at times typical for most IHE programs.

  To accommodate trainee scheduling needs, EPTPs can:
  - Allow trainees options for part-time study;
  - Offer, to the extent possible, project courses at times convenient to trainees; and,
  - Provide or coordinate child care services for trainee's children during class hours and study periods; and if possible, allocate monies for child care.

Surely, EPTP staffs are frequently burdened with heavy course loads and administrative responsibilities. They have little time left over for attending to each trainee's personal needs. Nonetheless, we believe that by devising mechanisms for responding to individual student needs, EPTPs can greatly reduce student attrition. In so doing, EPTPs enhance their effectiveness and efficacy in the eyes of participants, the home IHE, and the broader community.

As indicated throughout this report, members of our group learned a great deal from each other about EPTPs and about promising approaches for responding to problems areas in EPTP operations and institutionalization. This has lead us to believe that greater effort should be directed toward coordination, program development, and sharing of resources among faculties from bilingual education, ESL, and second language studies programs. We recommend, therefore, that another colloquium, similar to the one we have participated in,

should be convened, with the addition of specialists from modern and foreign language departments.

2.4 Budget planning and IHE cost assumption. Through discussing, comparing, and contrasting our programs, our group formulated a premise that drives our report: EPTP budgeting functions must be intimately tied into EPTP administrative frameworks with responsibilities for budget management clearly delineated, delegated, and coordinated, if EPTPs are to be institutionalized.

From this standpoint, we assert that, in general, EPTP directors must:

- Have a knowledge of processes for EPTP grant budgeting;
- At a minimum, be familiar with and have access to information on EDGAR documentation pertinent to EPTPs;
- Be aware of dollar amounts associated with employees in order to assess project status and impact in reference to the home IHE;
- Be apprised of and, if possible, sign off on every cent associated with the EPTP: Participate in processing documentation for EPTP expenditures, and justify each;
- Become acquainted with the jargon of budget processing under EPTP regulations: Avoid auditing problems that can arise if unacceptable terminology appears in budget documents (e.g., EPTPs are not allowed to 'contribute' project funds);
- Allow creatively for project flexibility in the budget to accommodate staff in such areas as summer salary funding provisions;
- Advise superiors and relevant offices of any budgetary changes that affect student financial status (and document communication regarding such changes); and,
- Involve Parent Advisory Committees and university officials in budgeting processes in order to ensure that all need areas have been identified and, to the extent possible, adequately addressed.

In addition, EPTP directors need to understand budgeting procedures operating in the home IHE. Project directors should become accustomed to hierarchies for decision-making, with regard to both explicit and implicit institutional auditing procedures ('who' controls and supports 'what'). In working within the home IHE, project directors should:

- Establish and maintain contact with decision-making bodies that can influence EPTP budgets, including the academic senate, employment and affirmative action offices, and academic departments or programs that offer courses relevant to trainees;

- Attend to curricular changes effected by programs outside the EPTP to ensure that trainees are availed of necessary services (e.g., intervene if a relevant program may be dropped due to low enrollment prior to trainee course sign-up);
- Clearly define lines of authority over program operations with other university officials. If necessary, negotiate or tap advisory committee influence for leverage in controlling the project monies;
- Involve university officials on advisory committees;
- Budget for adequate staff release time (75-100% for the director) to provide for project planning, oversight, monitoring, counseling, and or meetings: Document staff time usage;
- Expend effort to place EPTP staff on tenure track in order to facilitate project institutionalization and minimize staff cost demands on the project budget; and,
- Begin planning for institutionalization from the moment of project inception, with strategies for converting the project's operating funds from 'soft' to 'hard' monies.

We realize that the last point made above should be elaborated further: Project directors need not only strong and insightful management skills, but also appropriated funds matched to costs associated with proposed project objectives and activities. From this perspective, we find that program budget delineations presented in proposals influence the degree to which EPTPs succeed. We recommend, therefore, that proposed project budgets:

- Detail, validate, and document reasons for material and personnel funding requests;
- Provide adequate allocations for time dedicated to management; and,
- Guard against under-allocating funds for:
  - Coordinating, facilitating, and supervising trainee field experiences;
  - Acquiring materials, particularly specialized materials (such as disks for computer-assisted projects);
  - Reproducing or photocopying materials;
  - Covering staff travel costs (mileage, room, and food expenditures); and,
  - Building capacity through dissemination of publications, monographs, and videos developed by the project.

We recognize that proposed project budgets are subject to negotiation, and that, in the negotiation process, important budget appropriations can be reduced or abolished such that proposed project objectives can not be effectively addressed. For this reason, we present below some suggestions for project managers entering into budget negotiations:

- Prepare and keep in hand a very detailed budget: Know what it contains and where room for modification exists in order to protect essential project goals, objectives, and activities;
- Realize in advance that all requested monies will, probably, not be granted: Prioritize proposed activities and delete less important activities if/when the proposed budget is reduced;
- Ensure that a revised budget can be correlated with the project scope of activities: Document clearly activities that will be undertaken under a revised budget, and clear the revised scope of activities with OBEMLA for accountability purposes;
- Request from the IHE funds to support project activities deleted through budget negotiations;
- Observing budgetary line item agreements, appropriate funds creatively (documenting all specific uses of monies); and,
- Monitor funds directed to trainee support: Delineate clearly what trainees can and cannot use project funds for.

Strategies for budget management suggested thus far have addressed the early life stages of an EPTP. Looking now toward institutionalization, we will suggest practices that facilitate conversion of an EPTP from 'soft' to 'hard' monies, over time. As a caveat to our recommendations, we would like to acknowledge trends that show movement toward EPTP institutionalization. At the same time, we point out that as EPTPs move toward institutionalization, critical monies that support project trainees, staff, activities may be diminished. Aggressive efforts must be undertaken to ensure that the project will become institutionalized at full capacity. As such, we advise that EPTP directors:

- Apprise IHEs of the institutional benefits available through project cost-sharing, not only in the area of student support, but through provision of entrée, time, and funds to support staff publishing, research, and travel--project staff can bring visibility and prestige to the IHE;
- Tie the project's goals to the IHE's goals and missions, with regard to affirmative action policies, regional needs dictated by demographic realities, and efforts to develop leadership skills in native-born, immigrant, and refugee-student populations;
- Emphasize issues of enlightened 'self-interests' for IHEs that can be served by EPTPs;
- Seek continued funding from other federal sources, including:
  - CAMP projects funded through the Migrant Education Program;
  - Chapter II minority recruitment, remedial and tutorial project appropriates (seek RFPs from SEAs);
  - Chapter V, Early Education Program funds;

- Chapter VII, Women's Education Program funds available for administration, bilingual and international education areas; and,
- Student assistance appropriations.

Funding may also be sought from selected private foundations at the national, state, and local levels that place priority on areas of concern to the EPTP.

As our group discussed issues related to EPTP budgeting and cost assumption, we began to recognize a need experienced by EPTP directors for training in management and strategic planning. Project directors must lobby aggressively to amass support sufficient for program continuance and institutionalization. To develop these skills we recommend that project managers:

- Become familiar with relevant literature (recommended readings include *Managing Title VII Programs* by George de George, and *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies* by Thomas J. Peters and Robert H. Waterman (1982), New York: Harper and Row Publishers);
- Identify and align themselves with a skilled mentor; and,
- Seek training from a specialist in management or business administration.

In addition, we recommend that OBEMLA sponsor management training for EPTP directors that both exposes directors to prevalant management theories and allows directors to interact among themselves to share budget management strategies and concepts.

3. Evaluation

This final section of the Colloquium proceedings addresses issues and concerns in evaluating EPTPs. Historically, bilingual and ESL personnel training programs have not systematically monitored their progress, nor have they consistently documented project outcomes. While it appears that EPTPs have served their intended purposes over the past twenty years, most of the evidence to this effect is anecdotal in nature and not very useful for guiding future EPTP program development. For example, instances of EPTP institutionalization have been reported, but the processes through which institutionalization took place are not widely understood. New EPTP directors could easily access information on strategies that facilitated or impeded institutionalization for earlier EPTPs. In contrast, had EPTP activities, modifications, expansions, and deficiencies been clearly described, policy-makers and EPTP directors could have used the information to facilitate future institutionalization efforts.

Acknowledging the productive role that evaluation can play in strengthening educational programs within an institution and across institutions, the Colloquium encouraged discussion of this theme in two ways. First, each small group that discussed coordination and institutionalization topics was asked to suggest techniques for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of strategies it proposed. Evaluation, therefore, is covered in all of the small group consensus reports presented earlier in this document. Second, one small group was tasked to formulate a comprehensive framework for designing EPTP evaluations.

As the initial step in formulating a framework for EPTP evaluations, our group considered the purposes served by evaluation. We then explored the types of questions we would hope to address through EPTP evaluation efforts. Next, we shared thoughts on evaluation methods and practices that might be appropriate for monitoring and judging the effectiveness of various EPTP activities. Finally, as a group, we generated recommendations for improving EPTP evaluations, their utility and usability. Our report follows this organization.

3.1 Purposes of evaluation. Evaluation describes purposeful activities related to stated goals and objectives of a given program, in

relation to standards and guidelines established by professional organizations and authorizing agents. It also compares aspects of project operations with the individual project's motives, philosophy, anticipated outcomes, and participant needs. Evaluation can provide descriptions of ongoing program progress or completed activities from which recommendations can be developed to improve the program and to determine future goals.

In reference to EPTPs, the purpose of evaluation is to determine the extent to which a project has achieved its stated intent, with descriptions of operations and outcomes that indicate program status. To this end, EPTP evaluations must examine various aspects of program structure and functions and investigate the perspectives of all participants (including staff, trainees, and other persons or agencies influenced by the project).

3.2 Areas to be investigated in EPTP evaluations. Having agreed upon the basic purposes of evaluations, our group attempted to identify in detail the aspects of a program that must be defined and included in comprehensive EPTP evaluation designs. Because we recognized that great diversity exists among EPTPs, we considered it important to bring attention to the types of program characteristics and features that affect evaluation results. Our outline of program elements that should be addressed in EPTP evaluations is presented below:

1. Program philosophy and rationale: What motivates the program? What policies lie behind its existence and its realized structures? What set of context features in the surrounding IHE, community, state, and or nation prompted its conception and influenced its implementation?
2. Program components: What is the program design (on paper and in reality)? The following aspects of the EPTP should be considered:
   A. Plan of operation (as proposed and as practiced)--given:
      (1) The institutional organization
      (2) The IHE administration
      (3) Faculty research incentives and emphases
      (4) Fiscal Management
   B. Instructional faculty and staff working with the EPTP. Particular attention should be directed to the following:
      (1) Faculty and staff credentials and qualifications
      (2) IHE status or rank accorded to EPTP educators
      (3) EPTP faculty and staff access to resources (within and outside the IHE)
      (4) Faculty and staff experience with bilingual/ESL educator training, in general, and with Title VII-funded EPTPs
      (5) Linguistic and cultural backgrounds represented in EPTP staff and faculty

C. Curriculum and instruction: In reference to the following, what academic services are actually provided or coordinated through the EPTP in reference to:
   (1) Core courses required and offered by the EPTP
   (2) Elective courses offered by or coordinated through the EPTP
   (3) Major academic concentrations of the EPTP
   (4) Languages used for instruction in EPTP courses
   (5) Cross-cultural coursework associated with the EPTP
   (6) Field experiences offered to participants through the EPTP
   (7) Coursework developing language acquisition analysis skills in EPTP participants
   (8) The degree to which parental and community input to EPTP curriculum design is elicited and incorporated in the program

D. EPTP trainee population--considering characteristics of both the target student population and the actual student participants. The following program aspects should be studied:
   (1) Recruitment and selection procedures
   (2) Entry and exit criteria for the EPTP
   (3) Properties of academic advisement and monitoring services available through the EPTP
   (4) Student support services associated with the EPTP
   (5) Trainee academic progress and performance in the EPTP
   (6) Procedures for following career paths of trainees who have exited the EPTP
   (7) Evidence of student commitment to the EPTP and to serving the educational needs of language minority populations
   (8) Student changes in attitude or behavior as related to EPTP participation
   (9) Evidence of student-student coordination or networking relative to the EPTP.

These program aspects are important to both monitoring program progress and judging program effectiveness at various points in time. While progress and outcomes studies certainly should be included in EPTP evaluation designs, we also realize that impact studies carry particular weight in program continuation decisions. For this reason, we highlight below program aspects that should be carefully addressed in evaluation designs:

- Evidence of EPTP institutionalization;
- EPTP impact on the community;
- EPTP impact on schools;

- EPTP impact on trainees;
- EPTP impact on faculty, and IHE faculty perceptions of the EPTP;
- EPTP influences on policy-making bodies; and,
- Coordination and networking effected by the EPTP with SEAs, LEAs, and other education interest groups.

3.3 EPTP evaluation focus, design, and methodology. In determining designs for comprehensive EPTP evaluations, we suggest that process, formative and summative studies be conducted. Data for such studies can be collected through the strategies and from sources mentioned below:

For process studies, data can be collected through:

- Interviews with relevant stakeholders (students, faculty members with the EPTP and in the IHE at large, representatives from coordinating agencies (e.g., SEAs, LEAs, IHE administrative offices, and the community);
- Student evaluations of coursework and field experiences;
- Observations of EPTP courses and of trainees in field placements;
- Content analysis of EPTP reports and documentation;
- Monitoring of trainee performance on examinations; and,
- Monitoring of trainee grade point averages over time in the EPTP.

For formative studies, evaluations might seek the following indicators of EPTP progress:

- Evidence that might show the project's meeting stated objectives;
- Evidence that deliberations have occurred as a result of ongoing evaluation; and
- Evidence of impact related to program implementation.

For summative studies, evaluations should address:

- The degree to which an EPTP has achieved stated objectives;
- Project uses and sources of materials and resources;
- Evidence of project-sponsored or project-coordinated support services;
- Unanticipated outcomes of the project; and
- Future directions for program development

3.4 Recommendations reporting EPTP evaluations. As our group worked toward identifying elements common to EPTPs that should be addressed in EPTP evaluations, we also recognized problems and limitations that have influenced evaluation quality in the past. Rather

than simply listing the areas of difficulty, we formulated strategies for strengthening EPTP monitoring and assessment efforts. Our recommendations, presented below, fall into three categories: (1) Evaluation Funding and Agents, (2) Evaluation Reports, and (3) Guidelines for Designing Evaluations.

Evaluation funding and agents:

- The level of funding dedicated for evaluation in the EPTP budget should be sufficient to support all relevant evaluation activities. We suggest that OBEMLA consider establishing guidelines for allocating funds for evaluation, perhaps in the form of a minimum percentage of the EPTP budget (e.g., 5% to 7%).
- Both internal and external evaluators should be involved in monitoring and assessing long-term (three to five year) EPTPs. For short-term (one-year) EPTPs, external evaluation alone may be sufficient. Nonetheless, the grantee--namely, the home IHE--should assume full responsibility for the design and quality of evaluation activities associated with the EPTP.

Evaluation reports:

- Evaluation reporting standards should be developed, including clear specification of the intended audiences and minimum reporting criteria. We feel that OBEMLA should be involved in development of these standards or be asked to endorse standards established by a task force or committee.
- EPTPs should develop separate evaluation reports targeting various stake-holder audiences e.g., the community, the target population, university officials and the funding agent. In general, reports for the funding agent should be comprehensive and include technical documentation, while reports for other audiences may summarize the data and highlight the most significant findings.
- The evaluation reports submitted to the funding agency should, themselves, be considered in project monitoring processes; that is, the reports should indicate that evaluation designs presented in the project proposal are being/have been carried out as planned; or, if the designs have been modified, provide justification for any changes.

Guidelines for designing evaluations:

- At present, although EPTPs are required to conduct evaluation activities, no standards or guidelines for these activities have been established. We do not feel that OBEMLA should mandate the use of one particular model for EPTP evaluation. But, we do believe that OBEMLA should include in EPTP

requests for proposals specific requirements for EPTP data collection and evaluation coverage. Furthermore, OBEMLA should actively encourage EPTPs to review models described in evaluation literature to guide development of project-appropriate evaluation designs.

- In addition to final 'end-of-project' reports, yearly project progress reports should be prepared in order to compare project activities, structures, and effectiveness over EPTP lifespans.
- The home IHE should be encouraged to conduct follow-up evaluations of EPTPs, with funding made available to support such efforts. However, follow-up evaluation should not be required for all EPTPs because not all EPTPs will have the necessary time, human and material resources, or expertise to undertake productive studies of sustained impact after the project has ended. Possibly a consortium of Grantees could undertake the conduct of EPTP follow-up evaluations, were sufficient monies made available for this purpose.

The importance of evaluation for EPTP improvement is clearly demonstrated by the emphasis placed on this topic through this colloquium--where eight small groups suggested procedures for monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of coordination and institutionalization strategies, and where, in addition, our group's task was to focus exclusively on evaluation issues. Having worked with our colleagues over the two-day period of discussions, we feel certain that the technology and 'know-how' for conducting useful EPTP evaluations exist. We now hope that, as directors, we can continue to share our evaluation expertise, innovative ideas, and insights in order to build a research base to support EPTP improvement.

Appendix A.

Colloquium to Strengthen Education Personnel Training Programs: *Training Educational Personnel to Work with Language Minority Populations*

Agenda

Tuesday, July 28, 1987

4:00 - 8:00 p.m.	Registration	Intercultural Center - 462
4:00 - 5:00	Meeting/ Team Leaders and OBEMLA Team Monitors	Intercultural Center - 450
6:30 - 8:30	Reception Host/George Washington University	Galleria - ICC

Wednesday, July 29, 1987

7:00 - 8:00 a.m.	Registration	Village C
7:00 - 8:00	Breakfast Dining Program	New South Cafeteria
8:30 - 10:00	Opening Session	Village C Community Room

Orientation - Dr. John Staczek
Georgetown University

Opening Remarks - Ana Maria Farias, Esq.
Acting Director, *OBEMLA*

Rudy Muñis
Division Director, DNP
OBEMLA

Speaker - Dr. James E. Alatis, Dean
School of Languages and Linguistics
Georgetown University

10:00 - 10:15	Break	Village C
10:30 - 12:00 p.m.	Working Sessions	Village C

Group One:
State Education Agencies
Team Leader: Jesús Cortez

Group Two:
Local Education Agencies
Team Leader: Donaldo Macedo

Group Three:
Other IHE Training Programs
Team Leder: Andrea Bermúdez

Group Four:
Other Title VII and Non-Title VII Resources
Team Leader: Maria Torres

Group Five:
Staff/Faculty Resources
Team Leader: Macario Saldate

Group Six:
Inter/Intra-Departmental Coordination
Team Leader: Solomon Flores

Group Seven:
Student Characteristics and Recruitment
Team Leader: Annette López

Group Eight:
Budget Planning and Cost Assumption
Team Leader: Ronald Schwartz

	Group Nine: Evaluation Team Leader: Reyes Mazón	
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch Dining Program	New South Cafeteria
1:30 - 3:00	Working Sessions	
3:00 - 3:15	Break	Village C
3:30 - 5:00	Working Sessions	
7:00	Banquet	Galleria - ICC
	Speaker - Dr. Solomon Flores *University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee*	

Thursday, July 30, 1987

7:00 - 8:30 a.m.	Breakfast	New South Cafeteria
	Dining Program	
8:30 - 10:00	Working Sessions	
10:00 - 10:15	Break	Village C
10:30 - 12:00 p.m.	Working Session	
12:30 - 2:00	Luncheon	Village C Community Room
	Speaker - Leo López *California SEA*	
2:30 - 4:30	Final Working Sessions	
4:30 - 7:00	Dinner	New South Cafeteria

Friday, July 31, 1987

7:00 - 9:00 a.m.	Breakfast	New South Cafeteria
	Dining Program	

9:30 - 10:30	Meeting with Federal Project Officers *OBEMLA Project Officers *Grants Specialists	Village C
10:30 - 12:00 p.m.	Closing Session: Colloquium Reports	Village C Community Room
12:30	Adjornment	Village C Community Room

Closing Remarks - Dr. John Staczek
Georgetown University

Appendix B.

Small group participants and affiliations

1. Coordination

Post-secondary institutions

Andrea Bermúdez (Team Leader)

Wilf Cyr	*Arrowhead Community College, Minnesota*
Sandra Fradd	*University of Florida, Florida*
Eloy Gonzales	*University of New Mexico, New Mexico*
Barbara Kirk	*Central Michigan University, Michigan*
Suzanne Peregoy	*Sonoma State University, California*
Maria Medina Seidner	*State Education Agency, Illinois*
Paul Shell	*Northern Arizona University, Arizona*

State education agencies

Jesus Cortez (Team Leader)

L.J. Briggs	*Arrowhead Community College, Minnesota*
Rudy Chávez	*Eastern New Mexico University, New Mexico*
Phyllis Maslow	*California State University at Long Beach, California*
Josephine Pablo	*State Education Agency, Hawaii*
Carlos Rodríguez	*Southwest Texas State University, Texas*
Flora Rodríguez-Brown	*University of Illinois, Illinois*
Bill Savage	*University of Hawaii at Monoa, Hawaii*
Yolanda Torres	*D'Youville College, New York*
Keumsil Kim Yoon	*William Patterson College, New Jersey*

Local education agencies

Donaldo Macedo (Team Leader)

Adele Allen	*University of Arizona, Arizona*
Rudy Garcia	*University of Colorado, Regents, Colorado*
Tony Garcia	*California State University at San Bernardino, California*
Kathryn Garlow	*Palomar College, California*
Lilliana Minaya	*University of Connecticut, Connecticut*
J.A. Rodriguez	*Stephen F. Austin University, Texas*
Donald Smith	*Northwest Community College, Alaska*
Mike Travis	*State Education Agency, Alaska*
José Valderas	*Saginaw Valley State College, Michigan*

Other Title VII and non-Title VII resources

María Torres (Team Leader)

Aristides Cruz	*University of the Sacred Heart, Puerto Rico*
Charles Leyba	*California State University at Los Angeles, California*
Tomás Miranda	*State Education Agency, Connecticut*
J. Michael O'Malley	*Eastern Evaluation Assessment Center, Virginia*
Ramón Santiago	*Georgetown Multifunctional Resource Center, D.C.*
Antonio Simões	*New York University, New York*
Diana Soler	*Hofstra University, New York*
Joanne Sullivan	*Florida Atlantic University, Florida*
Felipe Veloz	*Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon*

2. Institutionalization

Staff and faculty resources

Macario Saldate (Team Leader)

Louise Auclair	*Notre Dame College, New Hampshire*
David Berlanga	*Corpus Christi State University, Texas*
Noe Flores	*Texas Wesleyan College, Texas*
Helgi Osterreich	*College of Sante Fe at Albuquerque, New Mexico*
Rudy Pacheco	*San Diego State University Foundation, California*

Delia Pompa	*State Education Agency, Texas*
Paul Yvarra	*University of Wisconsin at Whitewater, Wisconsin*
Sister Mary Consuela	*Immaculata College, Pennsylvania*

Inter-/Intra-departmental coordination

Solomon Flores (Team Leader)

Bonnie Brooks	*Central Washington University, Washington*
Joann Floyd	*Long Island University at Brooklyn, New York*
Jay Fuhriman	*Boise State University, Idaho*
Herman Garcia	*Texas Tech University, Texas*
George Lokken	*College of St. Scholastica, Minnesota*
Hank Oyama	*Pima Community College, Arizona*
Carmen Pérez Hogan	*State Education Agency, New York*
Alba Rosenman	*Ball State University, Indiana*
Robert Segura	*California State University at Fresno, California*

Student characteristics and recruitment

Annette López (Team Leader)

Roberto Gallegos	*New Mexico State University, Regents, New Mexico*
Gary Hargett	*Portland State University, Oregon*
Ruth Knight	*Weber State College, Utah*
Erasmo Saenz	*Pan American University, Texas*
Dennis Snell	*Northeastern State University, Oklahoma*

Budget planning and cost assumption

Ron Schwartz (Team Leader)

Harold Chu	*George Mason University, Virginia*
Rene Merino	*California State University at Sacramento, California*
José Prewitt-Díaz	*Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania*
Rudy Rodriguez	*Texas Women's University, Texas*
Sofia Santiesteban	*University of Miami, Florida*
Karen Watembach	*Eastern Montana College, Montana*

3. Evaluation

Reyes Mazón (Team Leader)

Walter Eliason	*Rider College, New Jersey*
Gus Garcia	*California State college at Bakersfield, California*
Joseph Kersting	*Western Illinois University, Illinois*
Marcelene Ling	*Western Oregon State College, Oregon*
Lilliam Malave	*State University of New York at Buffalo, New York*
Rudy Martinez	*Wayne State University, Michigan*
Irene Serna	*University of Illinois, Illinois*
Jorge Thomas	*New Mexico Highlands University, New Mexico*

OBEMLA Liaison for small groups

Mary Britt	Local education agencies; Inter-/Intra-departmental coordination
Edwin Neumann	Evaluation
Velma Robinson	Other Title VII and non-Title VII resources; Student characteristics and recruitment
James Rogers	State education agencies; Staff and faculty resources
Cindy Ryan	Post-secondary institutions; Budget planning and cost assumption

Recorders for small groups

Phillip Bray	Student characteristics and recruitment
Kathy Byrd	Local education agencies
Dawn Center	Budget planning and cost assumption
Tori Impink-Hernández	Post-secondary institutions
Jeannette Kwok	Other Title VII and non-Title VII resources

Theo Mantzanas	Evaluation
Gabrina Suazo	Staff and faculty resources
María Torres	State education agencies
Terry Weldon	Inter-/intra-departmental coordination

Appendix C.

Team leader responsibilities

1. Open and close each work session.
2. Monitor the progress of each session.
3 Review work session procedures.
4. Hand out materials to Participants.
5. Review each set of handouts with Participants.
6. Divide work sessions into small sessions, if necessary.
7. Lead the discussions for each work session 'Focus.'
8. Check to see that Participants are writing their ideas on the data collection forms.
9. Collect data collection forms.
10. At the end of each session, collect data collection forms and check them for clarity, completeness and accuracy.
11. Compare the Participant data collection forms with the data captured by the Recorder/Editor assigned to each session.
12. Collaborate with Recorder/Editor to finalize each set of data collection forms.
13. Collaborate with Recorder/Editor to finalize the 'Synthesis, Major Outcomes and Conclusions' forms for each work session subtopic.
14. At logical intervals, discuss the progress of each session with OBEMLA Session Liaison.

Participant Responsibilities

1. Attend all Work Sessions.
2. Complete Participant Profile Form.
3. Describe appropriate current components of their Programs on each data form provided.
4. Describe (on data forms) appropriate model components of an EPTP Program as it applies to their IHE.
5. Synthesize discussions, identify major outcomes an dprovide conclusions for each work session subtopic.
6. Introduce and discuss any appropriate topic(s) related to their work sessions.

7. Present any recommendations to OBEMLA Staff on EPTP in general.

Recorder/Editor Responsibilities

1. Assist each Work Session Team Leader in conducting a productive session.
2. List on each data form the major points for each subtopic focus.
3. Meet with Team Leader after each session (or break) to compare their notes and review notes turned in by participants.
4. Compile a master data collection form with data collected from Participants' and Team Leader's data collection forms. (One set describing current EPTP components and another master set describing Model components.)
5. Assist Team Leader in completing the final written Synthesis, Major Outcomes and Conclusions for each Work Session subtopic.
6. Collect Participant Profile forms and check for completeness and accuracy.
7. Seek clarifications at any time during discussions on any subtopic focus or related item.
8. At the end of the Work Session, the Recorder/Editor must have all of the following:

    a. Completed data collection forms from each Participant;
    b. Completed data collection forms from each Team Leader;
    c. Completed data collection forms from Recorder/Editor;
    d. Master data collection forms compiled from the Team Leader's, Participants' and their own data collection forms.
    e. The 'Synthesis, Major Outcomes and Conclusions' for each subtopic.
    f. Any completed and accurate Participant Profile Forms.
    g. Any other data requested during the Colloquium.

9. Organize all work session written outcomes and meet with a Component Editor to review the materials.

IHE: _____

Representative's Name: _____

Topic: _____

Subtopic: _____

Focus: _____

Topics	Actual	Consensus Model
Goal		
Activities		
Evaluation		
Limitations		